# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVI. NO. 45. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1856. WHOLE NO. 825.

**National Anti-Slavery Standard.**

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

*AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,*

*At its Office,* 138 *Nassau St., New York,*

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

**PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,**

31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cents for every subsequent one. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.


## Pro-Slavery.

*Editors of The Religious Herald.*

DEAR BRETHREN: Believing there are *misapprehensions of plain matters of fact* as to the relations of the American Tract Society to slavery, which, so far as they are groundless, none would wish to cherish, we request your kind insertion of the enclosed statement of facts, from those long conversant with the proceedings of which they speak, which were intended to be reliable, kind and courteous, and to favour harmony and Christian confidence.

The question, what advance the Society can make in presenting the evils of slavery, seems to us to be narrowed down almost to the single point *whether there are*, or shall be, publications presenting those evils in such a manner that evangelical Christians in the Northern and in the Southern States can unite in approving them.

With esteem, WM. A. HALLOCK, Sec'y.

For The Religious Herald.

### AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY—FACTS AS TO SLAVERY.

An honoured Vice-President of this Society, in one of the Northern States, in view of conflicting statements in some of the public papers, and not having been able himself to examine all the Society's publications, wrote to the Secretaries, inquiring, in substance, how far the Society bears its testimony against the evils of slavery; and on what grounds it refrains from more boldly denouncing the system, whoever it may offend, and whatever may be the consequences.

The Chairman of the Publishing Committee and senior Secretary, being, in the providence of God, the only surviving founders of the Society who have acted with that Committee throughout its history, returned the following answer.

NEW YORK, March 12, 1856.

RESPECTED AND DEAR SIR: We gratefully received your kind letter, and in reply state the facts as nearly as we are able to give them.

Let us first say, the idea that this Society has been *silent* as to the evil of slavery can be entertained by no one who has read its publications. Its works, like the moral and religious works of our language generally, and the holy Scriptures, make frequent allusions to the subject, never approving it, or apologizing for it. Indeed, were all the passages of the Bible having reference to slavery brought together in their order in one tract, we know of no obstacle to the Society's publishing it entire, if it appeared that such a tract would be useful. The executive officers of the Society, *as individuals*, have no sympathy with slavery; and *in executing a chartered trust*, they are as strictly bound not to offend Northern Christians by upholding the system as not to offend Southern Christians by unjustifiable denunciations.

*How far, then, can the Society go in showing the evils of slavery?*

We answer, its charter allows it to go so far as evangelical Christians in the Northern and in the Southern States can approve the publications it may issue, and no farther. The question is not now, at the end of thirty years, how the Society ought to have been, or might have been formed, but how *it was formed*. In May, 1825, Christians from the Southern States united publicly and solemnly before God in adopting this Society's Constitution as the basis of a National catholic Society, to receive the prayers, cooperation, donations and legacies of the whole country, for issuing such publications and such only, whether of "vital godliness," or "sound morality," as should be approved by "all evangelical Christians," North, South, East and West. No sophistry, evasion, or collusion, can change this historical fact. They acted from a belief that evangelical Christians do agree in the great essential truths by which men are blessed and saved, and unanimously bound themselves to each other, to the Christian community, and to God, to employ the Society's means only in publishing those truths; believing that if one class of evangelical Christians might be trespassed against, so might another, and the bond of union be dissolved. This compact has been understood by all our beloved associates, the dead and living. Never have we heard from one of them an intimation that it could have any other import. Every act of the Society to this day has been based on this understanding. In our labours to fulfil this sacred compact, we feel that we can bear to be misrepresented or censured; that if smitten on the one cheek, we can, by the grace of God, "turn the other also," "until seventy times seven"; but we cannot violate this solemn trust; the laws of God and the laws of the land forbid it. Nor can we virtually say of our brethren of different denominations south of Mason and Dixon's line, that they are *not* evangelical Christians in the sense of the Society's Constitution; for we know that, in the letter and spirit of that document, they were and are included as fully as Christians north of that line. God has led the Society into a great work for the destitute, bond and free, in our Southern and South-Western States, and we hear no call from Him to relinquish it.

But does not the Society, by publishing only what is "calculated to receive the approbation of all evangelical Christians," *virtually approve the errors which on this principle it does not rebuke?*

Not at all. The Society is a body corporate, to do a specified work by a prescribed means, and to do nothing else; just as the Bible Society can do nothing but circulate the Bible without note or comment. Those fulfilling such a trust thereby imply neither approval nor censure of any extraneous subject whatever. Nor do the Committee hold themselves bound to originate all publications needed on all subjects. This is the work of time. Their work is mainly to act on what is submitted to them for consideration.

But *has not the Society published*, on intemperance and other evils, what many evangelical Christians do not approve?

*It has not*, so far as we know. If the Committee had been so unwise, or so negligent, as by *wholesale* to approve all publications on one subject, and reject all publications on another subject, they would doubtless have given just ground of offence; but they do no such thing. Their action is not upon *subjects*, but upon *publications*, and each publication, on whatever subject, is examined on its own intrinsic merits. Because they adopt the scriptural appeals of Dr. Edwards on Temperance, it does not follow that they must publish all that was written to prevent the use of wine in the Lord's supper, or to exclude from that ordinance every one who does not totally abstain from the use or the traffic. Whatever is submitted to them for consideration, whether the subject be redemption, or intemperance, or slavery, or any other, if the tract submitted is found to be adapted, 1, to extensive usefulness, and, 2, to meet the approbation of "all evangelical Christians," the Committee adopt it. If it has not these qualities, they must reject it. Should some devout Christian author, in the spirit of the lamented Dr. John H. Rice, write and lay before them a tender, soul-loving appeal to the slaves of our country, or to those who have the responsibility of caring for their eternal welfare, such as evangelical Christians North and South would unite in approving, the Committee would have no wish to decline its adoption.

But have not the Committee sometimes erred in *omitting* from an evangelical work an offensive passage on slavery, as in Mather's Essays, Gurney's Love to God and Mary Lundie Duncan?*

They may have erred; and it might have been expedient not to issue the last mentioned work, evangelical, acceptable and useful as it is. The whole subject of preparing books for the most extensive usefulness has its difficulties. The Committee are cautious not to select books containing much denominational or other questionable matter; and when changes are made, distinctly to announce them in the book itself. All works of living authors are published under their own sanction, and abridgments and revisions are made only in accordance with established usage; but this and other topics are presented more fully, and, we trust, satisfactorily, in the official document issued by the officers of the Society, February 6, inserted in many of the religious papers, and in the *American Messenger* for March, to which we must refer.

With respect and esteem, your brethren and fellow-servants in Christ, JOHN KNOX, WM. A. HALLOCK.

* "A brief statement of facts as to a passage in each of those three books, on which comments have been publicly made, may be acceptable.

"Mather's Essays, issued in 1833, was abridged from the edition of the work then in general circulation, the Committee then having no knowledge of the existence of any copy of the original edition of 1710. The paragraph in question was printed word for word as it stood in the edition printed from; and a marginal note, saying that the original had there been abridged, was omitted. The Society's edition was discontinued in 1845.

"Of Gurney on Love to God, the stereotype plates were offered to the Society by a member of the Society of Friends in Philadelphia, in 1842; and the author, at the request of the donor, on the suggestion of the Committee, changed an illustration of two lines drawn from the subject of slavery. It was announced on the title-page, as 'revised under the sanction of the author.'

"The esteemed author of the memoir of Mary Lundie Duncan, in a letter from Scotland, entrusted that work to the Committee, to be abridged at their discretion. After the abridgments had been made, and before it was put to press, she visited this country, when, as Chairman and Secretary, we waited on her, more distinctly to learn her wishes; but, though anxious that her daughter's views of slavery should fully appear, she still left the matter, as she had done in her letter, to the discretion and responsibility of the Committee. It is perhaps violating no confidence to add, that the book was published under the impression that she preferred it should be issued as abridged rather than be withheld from many it might reach and bless though the Society's channels. From the paragraph in question, which, in the Society's edition, contains a full expression of Mary's joy at the West India emancipation, and of her prayers and sympathies for the slave, four lines, that it was supposed the Society could not consistently issue, were dropped. It was announced on the title-page as abridged by the Society; and in three years, about 14,000 have been circulated."

### FREED NEGROES.

THERE is a bill before the Legislature for the amendment of the law on the subject of the emancipation of slaves in this State. No point of our domestic policy requires more constant and careful attention. The presence, in the midst of a slave population, of a population of free negroes is an evil against which the slave States have uniformly legislated as one of vital interest to their social peace. To prevent the introduction of this class from abroad, they have exercised the right of legislation so stringently as to risk the danger of collision with foreign Governments, and adhered to these rights with unyielding determination, conceding nothing that would compromise the policy or the right of exclusion. Next in danger after the admission of foreign free blacks is the growth among us of a population of emancipated negroes and their descendants. They are a plague and a pest in the community, besides containing the elements of mischief to the slave population. In this State the power of emancipation, with privilege to the negro to remain in the State, has always been regarded with jealousy and hedged round with safeguards, which, it was thought, would prevent the liberation of any who would become a charge to the public, and secure in general the emigration of such out of the State. The old laws evidently contemplated emancipation as an occasional grace to meritorious servants for particular good service or general worthiness. But the practices under it grew to be so loose that the number of the emancipated became a subject of uneasiness in the State, both in respect to present inconveniences and to prospective evils. The Legislature of 1852 accordingly took up the subject and passed an act declaring that no slaves should be emancipated in the State thereafter, "except upon the express condition that, when emancipated, they should be sent out of the United States within twelve months after being emancipated," and requiring the deposit of $150 for each slave so emancipated, to pay for his transportation to Liberia, and his temporary support there. Under that act no slave could be emancipated and remain in the State without a special act of relief by the Legislature. At the next Legislature the applications for that relief were very numerous, and it must be confessed some of them were urgent and meritorious. Where the parents had been already regularly emancipated, it was but reasonable to ask that their children might remain with them. So of husband and wife, and of cases of particular personal merit or service, the best feelings became interested in frequent suspensions of the rigour of the law. But with these were multitudes of applications which had no merit at all, and were decidedly against public policy, although supported by local and personal interests. The Legislature was wearied with the consumption of time in investigating troublesome and doubtful cases. It was the experience of this single session, we believe, more than any settled change of opinion on the general question of the policy of the law, which led the succeeding Legislature, that of 1854–'55, to abolish the restriction in the act of 1852, and again to leave the question of the residence of emancipated negroes to the discretion of the local tribunals of the owner's domicil. The provisions of the existing law are well known. It submits the expediency of allowing the emancipation asked for—and the continuance of the emancipated within the State—to the vicinage; and the effect has been to renew, in an aggravated form, all the evils which the act of 1852 was designed to abolish. The number of emancipations has increased greatly. Almost every parish paper which comes to us is filled with notices of the intention to emancipate slaves, with the intention to remain in the State; and our City Courts are filled with the same sort of applications. Hundreds are thus made free and thrown upon the community—in most cases without any special merit—and because there is no interest, obligation or duty, anywhere, to take the trouble and responsibility of opposing and defeating the claims. They go through in crowds, supported by personal exertion and local feeling, but against the public policy and general interests of the States. The parishes do not feel sensibly the burden of each new case, and no one cares to be so ungenerous as to thwart and oppose the wishes of his neighbour, or get rid of a troublesome subject. These freed slaves, too, pass from parish to parish, or concentrate towards the City of New Orleans, so that the burdens do not necessarily fall and the dangers are not immediately brought upon those who create them; but the State gets an increase of a worthless population; more than its share falls upon the City of New Orleans. The evil is becoming more and more flagrant, until there is a very general conviction that the whole matter ought to be regulated by a statute, establishing the policy of the State against the growth of this practice, and that there should not be any right or power of relaxing the law left with local courts or police authorities. The experience of the facility with which these latter grant applications, without inquiry into their merits, and without respect to the general policy of the State, counsels strongly a return to the system of positive prohibition, leaving cases meriting exemption or relief to the discretion of the Legislature, as in all cases of the relaxation of positive laws to meet cases of individual hardship. It has come to be thought much safest for the interests of the State that the Legislature should forbid the emancipation of slaves altogether, except on the conditions of the act of 1852, that the emancipated black should be sent out of the State, and the means of transportation furnished by the owner, and that exceptional cases should be decided on grounds of general policy, by the representatives of the whole State, and not by a tribunal or jury of the vicinage.

The effort at Baton Rouge is, we hear, to establish this principle again, and we desire most earnestly to see it succeed.—*N. O. Picayune.*

### AMOS KENDALL'S BIBLE ARGUMENT FOR SLAVERY.

LETTER TO ISRAEL HUNT, ESQ.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 22d, 1856.

ISRAEL HUNT, ESQ.—*Dear Sir:* The sight of your name as chairman of a political meeting in Nashua carries me back to the happy days of boyhood, when, mounted upon bags of corn and rye, I rode to and fro between my father's farm and your father's mill. What changes have since occurred! Our fathers, having faithfully performed their duties to their God, their families and their country, sleep with the patriarchs. To their children they have left a glorious heritage, a country, a character, liberty of thought and action, self-government, blessings above what are now or ever have been vouchsafed to any people on earth. What wonder has not free mind, operating on matter, accomplished since we were boys? Macadamized roads, Steamboats, Railroads, the Locomotive, the Telegraph, gas lights, Daguerreotypes, Steam Printing Presses, and multitudes of other inventions and discoveries, have crowded upon each other in quick succession. As if Providence invited the extension of our Union with the design of bringing a whole continent under its peace-giving dominion, the means of more rapid travel and communication have been devised, as by Divine inspiration, so that the distance from ocean to ocean can now be traversed in less time than that from the Hudson to the Mississippi when the United States came into existence as a nation, while intelligence travels with the lightning's flash, leaving far behind the lagging sun. These are the offspring of peace and liberty, whose only security is the preservation and extension of our Union.

Yet, there are those, north and south, who would destroy this blessed Union! What infatuation, what madness! Do they expect thus to remedy all wrong and put an end to evil? As well might they expect to remedy all ills of earth by pulling down the protecting canopy of Heaven! Evil exists under the government of our God; but shall we, therefore, rebel against His authority? As it is our duty under the government of Heaven to labour for the suppression of evil, so is it our duty under the protection of our Union to labour for the same end; but he who would seek a remedy by destroying the protecting power which enables him to do good is worse than a madman, and I look upon him who, for any existing cause, would break the Union of these States *as a traitor* not only to his country, but *to God and man.*

I cannot, therefore, but look with alarm on any measure or any opinion which tends to weaken the bonds of union, whether found in the North or the South. That such measures are in progress is too painfully evident, and it becomes the friends of the Union to step forward in defence of our safety before it be too late.

I do not propose, however, to go into a general discussion of the subject. My purpose is to make a plain appeal to the *sincere Christians* of the country, and especially to the religious men and women of my native New England. The tendency of their opinions and acts is to divide the Churches north and south, and in like manner divide or break up the religious and benevolent associations of the country; indeed, to a great extent it has already been accomplished; and this of itself is a heavy blow at our political Union. Northern professors of religion, including multitudes of the clergy, now teach and act on the principle that the owner of slaves is unfit to be a member of their Churches, and of course is unfit to associate with them in the Heaven to which they aspire.

I own no slaves, and am not an advocate of the institution; but I wish, in a plain manner, to bring to the minds and hearts of my Northern brothers and sisters who are denouncing slaveholders the inconsistency of their present opinions and conduct with their own religious professions. They profess to believe the Bible to be "*the word of God*"; they profess to believe that its teachings and injunctions are of Divine inspiration; yet they are blind and deaf to its teachings and injunctions when they touch upon the subject of slavery.

Let me ask every clergyman and professor of religion, *Do you believe yourself to be a better man than Father Abraham?* Do you believe yourself to be more fit for Heaven than he was? Yet Abraham "dealt in flesh and blood"; he *bought servants with his money.* Your Bible tells you that God talked with this man; that he was a special favourite of the Almighty on account of his religious faith; and throughout your Bible he is represented as one of the best of men, "the Father of the Faithful."

Look at your Bible, Genesis, chapter 17, verses 2 to 18, where God is represented as speaking to Abraham, and saying, in verse 12, "And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house or *bought with money of any stranger* which is not of thy seed." In the next verse, God repeats the injunction. "He that is born in thy house and he that is *bought with thy money*," &c. And, in the 23d and 27th verses, we are informed that Abraham did circumcise, among others, those "bought with his money."

Although God is represented as talking with Abraham occasionally throughout his whole life, he never once condemned him for *buying men with his money*, nor, throughout the whole, is that practice represented as sinful.

Look now at the 25th chapter of Leviticus. It commences as follows, viz., "And the Lord spake unto Moses in Mount Sinai, saying, speak unto the children of Israel and say unto them"—then follows a chapter of God's commands, in 55 verses, regulating, among other things, different species of servitude. A Jew might buy a Jew, who was to serve six years. A stranger might buy a Jew, who, unless sooner redeemed, was to serve until the year of jubilee. The following verses were the word of God in relation to perpetual bondage, viz.:

44. "Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them *shall ye buy* bondmen and bondmaids.

45. "Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, *of them shall ye buy*, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land, and they shall be your possession.

46. "And ye shall take them for *an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession*; they *shall be your bondmen* FOREVER; but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigour."

Every man that believes the Bible must believe that these are the words of GOD HIMSELF. He must believe that the God whom he professes to serve, so far from denouncing slavery as a sin, unfitting men for the Church and for Heaven, *expressly authorized His chosen people to buy men and women and hold them in bondage forever!*

And who are those men, more holy than Abraham and more just than God, who would exclude from the Church and from Heaven their Southern brethren for a practice which God himself authorized! If they cannot sit in the Church on earth with good men of the South because they are slaveholders, how can they sit down in Heaven with those ancient slaveholders, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob? How can they be happy in the presence of that God who tolerated the practice in the Patriarchs and expressly authorized it in their descendants? Is not the God of this day the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob? Is there more than one Heaven for good men of every age and clime? Or must our modern Saints have a Heaven for themselves, and some better God than the God of the Bible?

The truth is, abolitionism, under its present aspect, is *the most direct road to infidelity the Devil ever invented.* It must and will, as in many instances it has done already, *throw away the Bible and deny the God of the Bible.*

Of this fact every real Christian will sooner or later become convinced.

I shall probably continue the subject.

AMOS KENDALL.

## Selections.

### ABOLITIONISM IN CINCINNATI IN 1843.

As the excitement in relation to the Fugitive Slaves is now suspended, we have thought a glance at the musty records of the last Abolition riots in this city might be interesting to the public. To be sure, this riot was only in 1843, but so vast has been the change since then in popular sentiment, that it is difficult to imagine the riots happened within the last hundred years. From January, 1836, to January, 1844, there were eight public mobs in this city. One of these was against Jews, one against Germans, one against Banks, and the others against Negroes and the few individuals who dared to acknowledge themselves Abolitionists. The *Gazette*, the *Enquirer* and the *Chronicle*, contained many such abusive epithets as "negro thieves," "British emissaries," "notorious characters," "incendiaries," "aliens," and "disturbers of the peace," addressed to those who were known to be opposed to slavery, and refused the privilege of replying, through their columns. In 1843, a man named Scanlan, who came up here from New Orleans, lost a little negro girl, named Lavinia, whom he had brought with him. Judge Reed had said in open Court, "Why do the Abolitionists trouble the Court with these cases—everybody knows that the moment any one brings a slave into this State that moment he is free; and if the person so bringing him should attempt to take him back again, he would be guilty of kidnapping, and subject himself to the penitentiary"; and the Abolitionists, knowing the girl had been brought here by her master, at once took her where she could be safe. A friend of Scanlan swore "by God, if they (meaning the Abolitionists) did not give up the girl by 4 o'clock, that afternoon (July 29), he would go over to Kentucky and raise a hell of a mob and pull down Harwood's house." Mr. Harwood was suspected of having given the girl that freedom to which she was legally entitled. The night before this threat, a mob had collected in front of Mr. Harwood's house, but did not attack it, as there was known to be ten well-armed resolute men inside. Scanlan, one Sunday morning, published handbills all over Cincinnati, that Mr. C. Burnett had boasted that he and ten others had sat up all night to defend the slave girl. This was false, as he had not said so, and the girl was far distant. He had only said that he and ten others had guarded the neighbour's house. The rumour, however, was sufficient occasion for a grand mob, which collected on Monday night, two thousand strong, to destroy the house of Mr. Alley, Mr. Burnett's son-in-law. When the Abolitionists ascertained the intention of the rioters, they prepared for a vigorous defence. Fifty stand of arms were collected in Mr. Alley's house, which was on the north side of Fifth street, and opposite the market-house. The little garrison that determined to sell their lives dearly, or make an effectual stand against the mob spirit that had always heretofore been victorious in Cincinnati, was composed of fifteen persons, most of whom were religious men, who, according to an account published afterwards in the *Chronicle*, "trusted in God to over-rule all these commotions, and who went about the thing conscientiously and as a matter of duty."

They first called on the Mayor of the city to defend the place, but he said that he was powerless against the mob, and they must trust to themselves. "They had thus become thoroughly convinced of the utter inefficiency of the city authorities to furnish any safeguard to the citizens for either life or property from mob violence; that the city had, for several years, been completely at the mercy of a mob, which had, in several instances, triumphantly asserted its supremacy, and there was no resource left but for every man to defend himself and his neighbour to the best of his ability from lawless outrage."

They elected officers, and assigned to every man his post. One man, whom they placed at the head of the Engineering Bureau, had his tools ready, and was to repair all breeches made by the mob. Two were assigned to guard each door, and fire the guns that were handed to them. Others were required to load and hand the guns to the door-men, while the younger ones, who were facetiously denominated the Brick-bat Guard, were stationed on the house to drop sundry articles on the heads of the assailants. The mob was led on by many men of property and standing, who demanded that the black girl should be given up to the master. Even Judge Walker, who made such an eloquent appeal in the late Rosetta case, was, during this riot, an active sympathizer with the mob, and not a paper wished or dared to censure the attempt to kill the Abolitionists. "In addition to all sorts of guns, the besieged had, according to our authority, piles of stones, brick-bats, bludgeons, flatirons, stone-hammers and lumps of old iron, mingled with glass-ware."

The mob was stimulated by addresses delivered at the end of the market-house; and procuring two butcher's heavy slab tables, placed one upon the other, and had thus a battering ram to dash in the door. They came on with loud cheers; and as they drove the ram against the door, the brick-bat guards fired down upon them a perfect storm of bricks and old iron. A man named Beresford, one named Bailey, and one other were badly hurt. The garrison did not fire, as they were determined only to do so when it was clearly in self-defence. The mob retreated some distance, and began a fire of stones that lasted several days. The garrison, during the night before the attack began, had laid in stores of provisions that would have lasted for a month's seige, and had made up one or two kegs of powder into cartridges. They were cool and quiet. Doubtful of the issue, they resolved, not on any account to fire on the mob in the street, but to shoot down all assailants who entered the building. The mob were afraid to batter the door again with the butcher's table, but kept up a constant, heavy fire of boulders and brick-bats.

For three days they kept up the fight; and some idea of the character of the engagement may be formed from the fact that, after the fight, the stones lay six inches deep in the back yard; and no fewer than three cart loads were taken from the second story of the house.

The doors, at last, began to give way; but the engineer went to work, and, having procured some heavy two-inch plank, placed it against the door and braced it so as to be stronger than the door was at first; boring, at the same time, holes, so as to give the assailants both a direct and a raking fire, if, as was threatened, a cannon was brought to fire into the building. Two of the besieged also undertook, while the others opened a raking fire on the crowd, to run out and spike the cannon. As an expedient, to guard against the boulders thrown into the upper windows, the besieged placed mattresses against the opening, etc.

The mob, beaten at last by the cool courage of this handful of men, gave way, and, on the next day, Alley's confectionary was opened, as usual, for the transaction of business. The mob spirit was conquered. The property destroyed by the mob was valued at $200, which was just one-fourth of that destroyed by the mob in 1841.

The affair was fitly closed with the following farewell shot, placarded about the streets:

"TO THE CITIZENS OF CINCINNATI:

"Is it right, is it just, is it honourable that such men as Jessie O'Neill, Robert Black, Alexander Dalzell, Peter Davidson and others, after having been chosen to office by our suffrages, to employ their time for their own especial benefit, and, contrary to their well-known duties as constables, to be frequently hunting men, women and children, who are carrying out, in their own persons, the very Declaration of American Independence which these constables pretend to venerate.

"Hear, ye professing Christians! and all ye who have hearts to feel for others' woes! hear what Jehovah says, in his Word: 'HIDE the outcasts. BEWRAY not him that wandereth; let mine OUTCASTS DWELL with thee: be thou a COVERT to them from the face of the SPOILER.' And again, in Deut., xxiii: 15, 16, 'Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee; he shall DWELL with thee, even AMONG you in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him.'

"Hearken to this, my fellow-citizens! and judge between us, who is right, in the sight of God, in the matter, he who HUNTS the poor ESCAPING SLAVE back again into SLAVERY, or he who assists him in fleeing from it? I say that, in less than ten years, yea, perhaps in less than five, we shall be ashamed that we ever had such men as Dalzell, O'Neill, Black and Davidson and others to do such DAMNING deeds of darkness. C. BURNETT.

"Cincinnati, Sept. 23, 1843.

Since this great riot how changed is public opinion. Now the negro-catchers are afraid of being mobbed by an indignant public.—*Cincinnati Sun.*

### AN ANTI-SLAVERY WORK.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A FUGITIVE NEGRO. By the Rev. S. R. WARD. London: John Snow.

AMONG the most distinguished advocates of the Anti-Slavery cause, and among those who have rendered it the most efficient service, are not a few persons in whose veins flow African blood. Many are the worthy names which we could enumerate. To make no reference to the illustrious dead—to exclude many of the living, and to confine ourselves to the negroes of America—how many of this proscribed race are now proving themselves to be worthy of freedom, and of the noblest rights and privileges of freemen, by the courage, perseverance, and powers of intellect, which they exhibit in their endeavours to burst asunder the bonds of the oppressed, and to emancipate themselves and their enslaved fellow-countrymen! We rejoice to find the coloured men of America taking so important a part in fighting their own battles. We rejoice to behold them engaged in the thickest of the conflict, determined to effect no compromise, and to come to no terms, with the spirit of evil against which they are contending. And we rejoice, also, to know that the majority of them render their best support to the radical Abolitionists, who, eschewing party politics and questions of expediency, are endeavouring to create such a moral revolution in the opinions of the American people as will infuse the anti-slavery spirit into the very soul of the nation. Robert Purvis, the man of upright life and generous purse—W. C. Nell, the historian of the coloured patriots of the Revolution—Charles Lenox Remond, the fervid and effective exposer of the wicked prejudice against colour—William Wells Brown, the well-known fugitive slave, author and journalist—these are among the coloured men of America who are spending their lives in the good work of upholding the party which advocates immediate and unconditional emancipation as the right of the slave and the duty of the master, and which invites the coöperation of *all* men, be their religious opinions and political principles what they may.

The Rev. Samuel Ringgold Ward is identified not with the movement to which we have referred, but with those political Abolitionists who, until recently, have been known by the name of the Liberty party—a party whose principal leaders are Gerrit Smith, a man of unbounded benevolence, high character and commanding talents; William Goodell, whose abilities as a journalist and historian are of no mean order; and Frederick Douglass, whose eloquence requires no eulogy from our pen, but whose anti-slavery career has been less consistent than that of his associates. Mr. Ward, in conjunction with these gentlemen and the party which they represent, has undoubtedly rendered important services to the Anti-Slavery cause, no less in America than in this country.

The work before us professes to be a record of Mr. Ward's anti-slavery labours in the United States, Canada and England, although by far the largest portion of it is occupied with notices of the labours of others, with an exposition of his views on the slavery question generally, and with details respecting the state of the coloured population of Canada and of the Free States. Much valuable information is communicated in the volume; the most important being, in our estimation, the author's just and uncompromising exposure of the support rendered to slavery by the Churches of America. His statements on this point satisfactorily demonstrate that they are the bulwarks of the iniquitous institution; and should elicit, on the part of British Christians, a more faithful and effective protest against their pro-slavery co-religionists on the other side of the Atlantic than many of them are, at present, disposed to deliver. By this we mean that the religious denominations of this country are bound by duties infinitely higher than any which might appear to be enjoined by sectarian relationships or party predilections to renounce all connection and sympathy with those ministers and churches in the United States whose policy it is either to ignore the question of slavery or to render to the system still more active support. The most dangerous enemies of Christianity are to be found within its own borders. The worst infidels to truth, to humanity, and to the Gospel, are those insidious emissaries of darkness, who make religion the friend of crime, and associate the name and the teachings of the Saviour with institutions which that Divine Teacher purposely came into the world to overthrow. The pro-slavery ministers and Christians of America, by supporting the most stupendous system of crime the world has ever seen, become themselves criminals of the worst stamp, and of the blackest dye; and we utterly fail to perceive how the religious bodies of this country can preserve the slightest bond of union with these persons without showing their guilt. They might just as well receive highway robbers and the recipients of stolen goods into communion with them, or admit into their pulpits the disciples of Ignatius Loyola. The pro-slavery Churches of America, measured by the standard of Christ, judged by the precepts of the Gospel, have no more right to be designated *Christian* Churches than had Judas Iscariot to be regarded a faithful servant of his Master when he had betrayed him. If, then, Christianity in this country is to be honest, and genuine, its friends must disavow all who trample upon its teachings, and especially those who dishonour it by their perfidy. True, such a course would involve some sacrifices, and would cause some pangs; but the fulfilment of duty is generally attended with suffering, and he who is unwilling to bear the cross must not expect to wear the crown.

To those who think we write with too much severity on this subject we commend Mr. Ward's book. They will there find that Lord Shaftesbury was not far wrong when he denounced the American Churches in question as "the synagogues of Satan."

Of Mr. Ward's book we cannot speak in terms of unqualified praise. His aristocratic friends and acquaintances play a rather too prominent part in it; and we shall continue to think so until we find that they are prepared to give something more substantial than their barren sympathy to the anti-slavery cause. No doubt Mr. Ward felt much pleased at being caressed and fêted by persons of title; but the men who interest themselves so little in promoting the cause of reform at home are not likely to do much towards striking off the fetters of the slave abroad. Moreover, Mr. Ward, in professing to give an impartial picture of the Anti-Slavery movement, has all but ignored the existence of thousands of earnest men and women, who, while he is cultivating his land in Jamaica, are actively engaged in much more arduous, benevolent, and self-sacrificing pursuits.—*The (London) Empire.*

### THE REQUISITION—THE ISSUE.

From The (Columbus, O.) Columbian.

BELOW will be found the report to the Governor, of the Agent of the State of Ohio, Joseph Cooper, Esq., of Cincinnati, charged with the service of the requisition on the Governor of Kentucky, in the recent murder case. It is a plain statement of facts, and shows the want of faith in the owner of the slaves, Mr. Gaines, in a light destructive of all confidence in that class of men. But we care less about this, and feel it less sensibly, than we do the mockery of the rights and dignity of Ohio which the whole case exhibits. We have not space for extended comments at this time, but the subject is not likely to be lost sight of by the press or the people.

To S. P. CHASE, Governor—*Sir:* On receiving from your hands a requisition upon the Governor of Kentucky, for the surrender of Margaret, Simon, Robert and Mary Garner, fugitives from the justice of this State, I proceeded immediately on my way to Frankfort, Kentucky, to obtain from the Governor of that State the necessary warrants for their delivery into my hands. I left here on Wednesday of last week, and Cincinnati on Thursday morning, on the first train of cars for Frankfort.

At Lexington there came on to the cars a man living in Covington, and known to me, who had in charge four slaves. I learned from him that they belonged to Mr. Gaines; that one was the mother of Margaret, another was a stout man, about thirty years old, and another a light-coloured mulatto girl, with a still lighter-coloured infant in her arms. These, he informed me, he was taking to Louisville, where Mr. Gaines's other slaves were lying in jail, and that, on his arrival, they would all be shipped down the river. He said that he expected Mr. Gaines would join him at Frankfort with Margaret. On arriving at Frankfort, he took the slaves on board the Louisville cars, and departed for that place.

It was about 4 o'clock P. M. when I reached Frankfort. I proceeded immediately to the Governor's office, where I met him in the afternoon. From him I learned that Mr. Gaines had left Frankfort that day, in the morning train of cars for Louisville, and had taken Margaret with him, stating that he wished her to be with the children, but that he would hold her subject to the requisition of the Governor of Ohio. I handed him the requisition and the papers accompanying it, and, having looked them over, he stated that he would issue his warrant for all the fugitives, but as the papers presented a case different in form from usual cases, he wished to consult the Attorney-General, and that he would give me a final answer in the morning.

In the meantime he ordered a telegraph to be sent to Mr. Gaines, stating the arrival of the requisition, and requesting him to either bring Margaret to Frankfort the next morning, or hold her in readiness for delivery at Louisville. As to the other fugitives, he said he believed Mr. Gaines did not own them; but he had no doubt they would be forthcoming should he issue his warrant for their delivery.

In the morning I waited again upon the Governor, and received from him separate warrants for all the fugitives. As Mr. Gaines had not arrived, he telegraphed him again, to hold Margaret in readiness for surrender to me.

After receiving the warrants, I departed on the first train of cars for Louisville, and reached that place about 8 o'clock in the evening. I proceeded immediately to the jail, and was informed by the jailor that, in the morning of that day (Friday), Mr. Gaines had taken his slaves from the jail, including all of the fugitives, and shipped them down the river.

As the Governor and other gentlemen had expressed the utmost conviction that the fugitives would be forthcoming, I was unwilling to credit the statement of the jailor, and, having delivered the warrants into the hands of the Marshal of Louisville, I spent Saturday in endeavouring to ascertain the truth of the jailor's information. Having become satisfied of its correctness, and believing there would be no use in pursuing the fugitives farther, I returned to Ohio, leaving, however, the warrants in the hands of the Marshal.

On my way up the river, I met an individual who had been a hand on board the Henry Lewis, the only boat on which Mr. Gaines could have shipped the negroes. From him I learned that all the fugitives were put on board that boat; and that, when about forty miles distant from Evansville, Indiana, the Henry Lewis was run into by another boat, and sunk, and that some twenty-five passengers perished; and among the rest was Margaret's babe; that the remainder of the negroes were re-shipped upon another boat for Arkansas, to which place they are now on their way. Respectfully, JOSEPH COOPER.

Columbus, March 11, 1856.

### LIBERTY OR DEATH.

IN that "good time" about which poets write, in which the award of merit will not depend upon the colour of a man's skin, the noble daring of some of the fugitive slaves who have escaped to Canada during the past winter will form the theme for the praises of the orator and the poet. They will rank alongside of those hardy deeds which our fathers performed during *their* great struggle for freedom. They will be carried down to the remotest generations, as the mementoes of an age in which bondmen rose up, and, by their noble daring, elicited the admiration of those who, before, had doubted their *humanity.* But we are not so recklessly imprudent as to forfeit the esteem of the great American people by claiming that, in *this* enlightened age, a noble deed in a *Negro* should excite the highest admiration of *white* men! Yet we shall be bold enough to relate an instance of daring, which, if it had been performed by Dr. Kane or Captain Ingraham, or some other noted personage, would have called out the unanimous praise of the American people.

The *chattels* of certain praying and devout men, citizens of the enlightened State of Kentucky, formed the wicked design of ceasing to work for nothing; and so they prepared to fly to the profane Abolitionists of the North, who, it must be borne in mind, impiously deny that a man with a black skin is *property.* The *chattels*, taking advantage of the icy pathway across the Ohio river, soon left behind them the land in which is practised the doctrine that the "rod of correction, if applied to slaves, bringeth a man riches and honour." The wicked people of Ohio, unmindful of their duty to the law and the Constitution, audaciously encouraged the *chattels*, and gave them meat and drink, and put money in their purse that they might have the wherewith to buy food for themselves when they should come among strangers. After many strange adventures, they arrived at Sandusky, where they were put under the charge of some members of the great American *Track* Society, who, learning that some pious Kentuckians, armed with a Commissioner's warrant, were seeking the fugitives, placed them in a sleigh, well provided with clothing and provisions, and bade the trusty driver deliver them safe in Canada. For the remainder of the narrative, we are indebted to a gentleman from Windsor, who conversed with the *chattels.*

After crossing Sandusky Bay, they made directly for the "Islands," where they arrived before dusk. Here they partook of some refreshments, and allowed their jaded horses to rest. Shortly after midnight they resumed their perilous journey; but after proceeding a few miles, they were beset with a furious snow-storm and lost their way. About nine o'clock next morning, they found themselves near land, which they at first took to be Canada, but, on a close inspection, they discovered that they were near the spot from which they had started on the previous night. The driver had some difficulty in persuading the fugitives to land, and some of them insisted on starting for Canada on foot. Finally their fears were overcome, and they consented to land. A succession of snow-storms continued throughout the day, and it was not till nearly midnight that the party could again set out for the land where no Fugitive Law is in force.

After proceeding about fifteen miles, they were beset with another snow-storm, and, as if to add to their difficulties, they came to an opening in the ice, varying from five to eight feet in width. They followed it several miles westward, and found that it became wider; then they retraced their course, and continued eastward, with no better success. The driver said it was useless to attempt to cross with the team, and proposed that the fugitives should leap the barrier and pursue the remainder of their hazardous journey alone. One of the *chattels*, with a presence of mind which would entitle a *white* man to the highest praise, suggested that a bridge might be formed of the sleigh. It was accordingly taken to pieces, a passage constructed across the opening, and the horses with difficulty forced over it. Several hours were wasted in the operation

provide? Why, that if one of the abused slaves of Kentucky shall have the manhood to achieve his own freedom, if he shall carve it out in spite of the master and through the Government, why, then "*it shall be lawful* to claim and hold," to try and condemn, imprison, bind and transport through and out of the State, *such heroic devotee* of *freedom as a slave?* It is designed to save such as young Simon Garner who had had the good fortune to be brought to this State by his master, but it as specifically provides for the reenslavement of his old gray-headed father, who had manfully achieved his own freedom without any such antecedent.

We have another objection to this proposed law. It not only proposes to execute the slave rendition clause of the Constitution, but, standing alone, as it does, it is in fact an endorsement of the Fugitive Slave law itself. That law is the only method in existence for executing the constitutional obligation of slave rendition. As this act provides that that rendition is not to be interfered with, of course we must understand its silence about the means of effecting it as an acquiescence in those already in existence. Indeed, this provision of the law, if such it shall become, seems to us the most abject of voluntary humiliation before the Slave Power. We trust that, in the course of discussion on this question, Mr. Brown will become wiser, and that the Legislature will not place upon our statute book a formal consent for the return of fugitive slaves. Surely it was enough for the Republican party that it ignored the existence of the Fugitive Slave law. We did not expect it to out-Herod Whig and Democrat and approve it by their legislation. On the whole, therefore, we cannot agree with the *Cleveland Leader* that Portage County may well be proud of her Senator for originating these two sections of law. Last week, our friend Gilbert testified that Mr. Brown was a "sterling Abolitionist," and had done much for correcting the pro-slavery sentiment of the country. We can only say that we hope his labours have been more effective upon others than this bill proves them to have been upon himself. For it does certainly look ugly to see a "sterling Abolitionist" proposing a law which concedes the right of citizens of other States to enslave the self-emancipated residents of Ohio. When Mr. Brown began to write his law, very likely his "sterling abolitionism" was uppermost. The first paragraph sounds altogether abolition-like: "It shall be unlawful for any person to hold or claim as a slave any other person in the State of Ohio, for any period whatsoever." That *is* "sterling abolitionism." It can't be beat. Had it stopped there, we would have swung our hat with Barclay Gilbert with a will, and commended his just pride of such a Senator. But the proviso is pro-slavery, doughfaced and Union-saving. We despise and abhor it. The man who attempts to embody it in law is not the man to lead in the emancipation of Ohio from her guilty and disgraceful subjection to the Slave Power. Before that advent comes, somebody has got to resolve, in the Legislature and on the Judicial Bench of the State, that even the Constitution and the Union cannot and shall not sustain slaveholding in Ohio, and that no human being shall be sent from her soil to slavery, and all the people, Republicans among the rest, must shout amen, and confirm and defend the decision.

We repeat the hope that the Legislature will not dishonour themselves and betray the cause of liberty by the adoption of this law in its present form.—*Anti-Slavery Bugle.*

### *THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY AND ITS SECTARIAN OPPONENTS.*

BOSTON, March 18, 1856.

*To the Editor of The London Anti-Slavery Advocate.*

DEAR FRIEND: It is seldom I am induced to make a public refutation of any of the malicious allegations which are brought against the American Anti-Slavery Society, whether by open pro-slavery enemies or the pseudo friends of negro emancipation, at home or abroad; because they are all most effectually answered by an unswerving adherence to the cause of the oppressed; and because to notice them in detail would be an endless task. But, in view of the insidious efforts making on your side of the Atlantic to destroy all confidence in this Society, through unprincipled emissaries from the United States, aided by those who, under an anti-slavery garb, affect to be *religiously* concerned for the integrity of the movement to which my life is consecrated, I can do no less than to send you a brief letter, explanatory and defensive—not for my sake personally, but to disabuse the minds of the truly pure and good, that may have been poisoned by the hand of malice, or alarmed by the tocsin of bigotry.

Hitherto, the American Anti-Slavery Society has received generous aid from England and the Continent, which it has gratefully appreciated, and faithfully applied to the promotion of the cause in the manner designed by the donors. Why should not the same cooperation be continued? Has the Society any other object in view than the abolition of chattel slavery? No. Has it turned aside from its legitimate work to subserve an ulterior purpose? No. Has it yielded one jot or tittle of the rights of the slave, to screen any sect or party from merited condemnation? No. Has it ever been a respecter of persons? No. Has it ever been found wanting in moral intrepidity, personal self-sacrifice, untiring vigilance or laborious effort? No. Has it presumed to arraign any man, or any body of men, religiously or politically, on any other than a pro-slavery charge, sustained by overwhelming evidence? No. Has it ever attempted to discuss or settle any theological opinions or denominational views, aside from the question of slavery? No. Is it possible for an organization to be more true, disinterested or impartial, in the prosecution of its specific work? No. Has it ever shrunk from the closest scrutiny "before all Israel and the sun"? No.

The questions I have asked and answered, and answered truly, are sufficiently definite and comprehensive to meet every calumny circulating among you against the Society. Why, then, is it not still deserving the generous sympathy and aid of every friend of freedom?

To the charge that is made, in certain quarters, that it is an "infidel" Society, I reply, first, that this is an old device of priestcraft and despotism, to put down every righteous reform; secondly, that, in the sense in which it is used, and designed to be understood, it is a most wicked misrepresentation; thirdly, that it is coined and circulated either through deadly enmity to the anti-slavery movement, or by sectarian intolerance, or personal malevolence or selfishness; and, finally, that the Society has ever vindicated Christ and His Gospel as inimical to oppression in every form, and, therefore, properly denied that the slave-breeding and slave-hunting religion of this guilty land is genuine Christianity.

The manner in which it is attempted to sustain this slanderous imputation is equally impudent and absurd. For example: in an editorial article in the Glasgow *Chronicle* of January 30th, I find the American Anti-Slavery Society denounced as clearly "infidel," because 1, its President, on a certain occasion, attended a Convention held in Hartford (Ct.), to consider the question of the plenary inspiration of the Bible, and offered and sustained a series of resolutions in opposition to the popular dogma respecting that volume! The *Chronicle* falsely styles it an "*Anti-Bible* Convention"—how falsely, let the following extract from the Call for the Convention decide:

"TO THE FRIENDS OF FREE DISCUSSION. The undersigned hereby invite all who are friendly to free discussion to attend a Convention to be held at Hartford (Ct.), on Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday, 2d, 3d, 4th and 5th of June next, for the purpose of freely and fully canvassing the ORIGIN, AUTHORITY AND INFLUENCE OF THE JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN SCRIPTURES.

"This invitation is not given to any particular class of Philosophers, Theologians or Thinkers, but is in good faith extended to all who feel an interest in the examination of the question above stated. There are many who believe that a supernatural Revelation has been given to man; many others who deny this, and a large number who are afflicted with perplexing doubts—trembling between the silent skepticism of their reason and the fear of absolute denial. In issuing a call for a Convention, we have in view the correction of error, *by which party soever entertained*, and the relief of those who stand between doubt and fear from their embarrassing position.

"Some may have no doubt that the Jewish and Christian Scriptures have subserved an important end, and yet believe their mission is nearly completed, and must be superseded by a new dispensation; some may believe that their influence has been prejudicial in every respect, and that they have been a curse rather than a blessing to mankind; others may believe them a perfect record of the Divine will to man—good in the past, and for all time to come; and others still may deny the plenary inspiration of the Bible, discarding much of the Old Testament, and receiving most or all of the New. Still, such diversity of opinion, instead of prejudicing the interest and good results which ought to attend such a Convention, will rather tend to increase its interest and enhance its value to the cause of Truth.

"Doubtless a free interchange of thought is the best mode of exciting inquiry, and of arriving at the Truth.

"He who has a Truth, and keeps it,
Keeps what not to him belongs;
But performs a selfish action,
And his fellow mortal wrongs."

"We invite, therefore, all who feel an interest in this question, without distinction of sex, colour, sect or party, to come together, that we may sit down like brethren in a communion before the altar of intellectual and spiritual Freedom.

Now, that I was present at this Convention, and did what the *Chronicle* alleges, is true; but not as President of the American Anti-Slavery Society, nor as an Abolitionist, but simply as a man, on my own responsibility, and *so explicitly declaring at the time.* Who but a bigot in heart, or a despot in spirit, will question my right to attend such a Convention, and to be true to my own convictions? Or who but a simpleton or a knave will maintain that the American Anti-Slavery Society is to be held responsible for an act with which it had no more to do than with the attack on Sebastopol? Or who but one assuming to bear the robes of papal infallibility will presume to set me down as a heretic or an infidel, because I will not surrender my reason, judgment and conscience at his dictation, and allow him to play the usurper over me? Who the editor of the *Chronicle* is, I neither know nor care to know, beyond what is clearly manifest to my mind in his case—and that is, that not one drop of genuine *Protestant* blood is running in his veins; that, had he lived in the days of Jesus, he would have piously clamoured for his crucifixion, having "heard his blasphemy," and seen that he was "not of God," because he did not keep the Sabbath day; that he is hostile alike to the rights of man and to the gospel of freedom; and that he is not an avowed Romanist only because he happens to reside in Scotland, and not in Italy. I judge him as Jesus did certain godly pretenders when he exclaimed, "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, "If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up, then, the measure of your fathers!"

Whatever my religious sentiments may be (and this is neither the time nor the place to state or defend them), I cherish them with the deepest sincerity, conscientiously believing that they are strictly in accordance with the angelic song, "Glory to God in the highest; on earth peace; good will towards men"—and reverently accepting the apostolic declaration, "So, then, every one of us shall give account of himself to God," not to any human tribunal!

The cry of "infidelity" from Protestant lips, on account of a difference of religious belief to any extent whatever, is an express repudiation of the grand fundamental Protestant doctrine of the right of private judgment and individual conscience, against all papal domination and ecclesiastical authority. The Romish Church consistently includes all Protestants in its category of heretics and infidels, from Martin Luther to Thomas Paine, and justly laughs to scorn the pharisaical, sectarian pretensions which exist among Dissenters. Concede the right to every soul to decide for itself what is true, or what is inspired, and no man can be an infidel, except he be false to his own standard, or his own professions or pledges. This opprobrious epithet, therefore, should be banished from the vocabulary of all Protestants; and no lover of mental freedom, no just and upright mind, will ever resort to it, to stain the character or destroy the influence of any one. To be in an error, theologically or religiously, is no proof of infidelity; for if the errorist be sincere in his opinion, and true to his own conscience, there is no higher fidelity beneath the stars. The Protestant who shouts "infidel" is a Papist in disguise; just as a Democratic advocate of chattel slavery is an absolute tyrant in principle.

But with all this the American Anti-Slavery Society has no concern. It is a simple association, organized for a specific object, on a common platform, requiring as the condition of membership only an assent to the doctrine that slaveholding is, under all circumstances, inexcusable, and that immediate emancipation is the duty of the master and the right of the slave. It has no theological or party test. It takes, and can take, no cognizance of the peculiar religious or political views of its members; it is not responsible for anything they may say or do in their individual capacity; it leaves them as free to promulgate their distinctive opinions on all subjects, outside of its own chosen sphere, as the air of heaven to circulate. In all these respects, it is precisely like the temperance, peace, suffrage, anti-corn law, and other general movements for the promotion of the common welfare; like them, amenable only for what it does in its official capacity, but made up of persons of all conflicting opinions on other subjects, who surrender nothing by coming together, and who endorse nothing but the rectitude of the object they aim to accomplish. It is a low device, therefore, on the part of its enemies, and indicative of anything but true sympathy for the fettered slave, to make it responsible for my views, or those of any other officer or member, respecting the Bible, the Sabbath, or any other controverted question. When it is "infidel" to the cause of the oppressed—when it misapplies the funds contributed to its treasury—when, for the sake of numbers, popularity, or means, it compromises its principles or weakens its testimonies—then let it be abandoned by all genuine Abolitionists; but not till then.

More I have not time to add before the mail closes. What more need be added?

For your faithful cooperation with us, my dear friend, "through evil report and through good report," I remain, gratefully. Yours, to break every yoke,

WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

### *A SEIZURE OF SHARP'S RIFLES.*

A CORRESPONDENT of *The N. Y. Times*, at Topeka, gives an account of a seizure of Sharp's rifles, on their way to the Kansas Free States' men, by the Border Ruffians.

Last Sunday, Dr. Cutter, the celebrated physiologist and author, from Warren, Mass., arrived in town. It was soon made known to a select circle that he started with one hundred Sharp's rifles and two pieces of cannon, which were on their way up the river, in charge of a Mr. Hoyt and three other gentlemen, all from New England. Nothing was talked of the affair in public until Tuesday morning, when the stage-driver brought us the rumour that one hundred rifles and two cannon were taken on board the steamer Arabia coming up the river, and that four men who were in charge of them had been hung. This coincided so nearly with the facts known beforehand to a few of us that we feared seriously it would prove true. We concluded to wait, however, for further evidence, and this morning it came, borne by the gentlemen themselves, who have escaped hanging, drowning and other threatened outrages, and are to-day safely with us. I learn their story as follows:

They arrived at St. Louis without being aware that they were seriously suspected, and went on board the Arabia, Tuesday, the 4th inst. Dr. Cutter and one other gentleman of the party concluded to take the land route and meet the others at this place. For fear the rifles might be taken, the Dr. took all the gates or slides from the rifles, also from the cannon, to render them useless to those who might capture them. These slides were packed in their trunks, and are now in safe hands in this town. The rifles can never be used until they are put together, unless the Missourians invent some method by which a smooth barrel can shoot both ways at once. Mr. Hoyt, who was the principal agent in charge of them, says there was nothing occurred for two or three days to lead them to think they were suspected. On Wednesday, I think, a letter was found upon the table in the cabin, which led to bringing out the whole affair, but the character or history of this letter I am not now permitted to give to the public.

The excitement soon grew intense, and a Dr. Porter, of Independence, soon moved to thrown the guns overboard. and that all the men implicated—for they soon learned that there were four belonging to the company—should have stones tied around their necks, so they could not get ashore, and be thrown overboard also. It occurred to some one that it would be best to find out, before proceeding further, for a certainty that the guns were on board. Therefore a committee of search were appointed, composed of some of the first men in Western Missouri, in respect to influence and wealth. The Committee was as follows: C. W. Bell, President, of Brunswick; O. A. McFarland, Secretary, of Richmond; Dr. Porter, of Independence; Mr. Emerson; Chas. Kearney, of Westport; Dr. Prewitt, of Parkville.

This Committee soon found them down in the hold, at the bottom of all the freight, and for a time no owner appeared for them. While they were providing some way to get them ashore safely, Mr. Hoyt stepped up and told them he would take charge of them when they landed. This remark brought down upon him all manner of threats, which he bore with great complacency; and when Dr. Porter threatened to throw him overboard, he replied that he hoped to have the privilege of dining once more with that fat face of his before he was thrown over. Mr Brady, the pro-slavery State Printer, was aboard, and, being somewhat of a lawyer, he intimated that the Captain of the boat would be liable for damages, if property was destroyed. This opened a new field for debate, which soon waxed hot, and resulted in a bloody fist-fight between Brady and Dr. Porter, which was ended by the interference of the Captain. At this stage of affairs another Committee was appointed for the depositing, securing and safe-keeping of the guns, consisting of Dr. Porter, of Independence; Dr. Prewitt, of Parkville; Chas. Kearney, of Westport; Col. Hall, of Independence; Mr. Elkins, of Westport.

The Committee showed some unwillingness to assume the responsibility; and when they arrived at Lexington, they took Hoyt upon the upper deck and there told him unless he gave up the guns and released the Captain from all liability, that they would not be responsible for the mob that was now coming down upon the Levee in great numbers, armed with guns and clubs, and their threats filled the air as they cried out "hang them, hang them! throw the wretches overboard!" &c., &c. Hoyt was finally forced to sign a receipt in full for the articles, and the Committe signed an obligation to Hoyt that the guns should be deliverable to the order of Gov. Shannon or his successor, they also paying the freight. This was a forced affair, as Hoyt would never have signed such receipt if death had not been apparently the alternative. With this evidence, they are legally just as liable for the cost of the guns as though they were robbed upon the highway, without any papers being signed. After this had occurred, they put the guns on shore at Lexington, and many wanted to get them out immediately for use. One said he had always wanted a Sharp's rifle and would give $30 if they would let him pick out one; another said he tried to get one at Lawrence last Fall, and would give them $25 for one, and so on. Probably the bids won't run so high when they discover that the loading apparatus is missing.

After the boat started on, the company tried to atone to Hoyt for the past, and complimented him very highly, saying they never knew a man to conduct himself so bravely before, in such a peculiar crisis. He landed safely at Kansas, and the whole party came in here to-day. To-morrow morning, Mr. Hoyt will go to Lecompton and demand an order from Gov. Shannon for the guns. We expect more music yet from the affair. Dr. Cutter is quiet and composed, and feels that the *cause* is doing well, whatever may become of the guns. It is now ascertained that a part of the company on the boat who were active in the capture had been through N. E. and other States, had followed Pomeroy around the country, and listended to all the plans about sending on rifles, &c. They came on in the same train with them, but did not choose to make their business known till they got into Missouri. The Captain told Mr. Hoyt, on the boat, that he knew guns were aboard soon after leaving St. Louis. This proves to our Eastern friends that they must be "wise as serpents," if not as harmless as doves.

### *LETTER FROM CASSIUS M. CLAY.*

From The Kansas Herald of Freedom.

WHITEHALL, Ky., Feb. 12, 1856.

G. W. BROWN, ESQ.—*My Dear Sir:* I have long since foreseen and deplored your troubles, have denounced publicly the repealers of the Missouri Compromise as worthy of death—not imprecating violence, but grading the guilt of those who cause so great calamities! The invasion of your Territory by the Ruffians from Missouri has been most gallantly repulsed. I lectured through all the North last Winter, and everywhere warned the people of the free States of the true intentions of the slavery propaganda—to use the Union as long as it was turned to the strengthening of slavery, and then to throw it aside—*if* they could! The first act of the drama is past, but do not flatter yourselves that it is the last. You will have to fight again or be subjected! Mark what I tell you. Unless you are prepared to repel force from slaveholders, you will never have peace! I have tried them for twenty years. They have no magnanimity, no remorse, no mercy! The world does not begin to know them, and never will. My heart bleeds in anticipation of your wrongs. I would that it was in the providence of events that I could lend you my feeble strength in person, or means; but, alas! I, too, am depressed in spirit and means by the long and solitary war I have carried on against superior odds; and cannot, at my time of life, and with a large family, join in your common defence, and ultimate glory. What I can do, however, will not be reluctantly acceded. You will yet conquer, and millions in long futurity will bear in grateful memory the deeds of your sacrifice and triumph in the cause of Humanity.

Your friend, C. M. CLAY.


# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 29. 1856.


*TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING*
OF THE
## AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY!

THE Twenty-Third Public Anniversay of the American Anti-Slavery Society will be held at the CITY ASSEMBLY ROOMS (No. 446 Broadway, between Howard and Grand sts.), in the City of New York, on WEDNESDAY, May 7th, at 10 o'clock A. M., and will be continued at the same place during the remainder of the day, and on THURSDAY, 8th. Addresses are expected from WM. LLOYD GARRISON, WENDELL PHILLIPS, Rev. THEODORE PARKER, Mrs. LUCY STONE BLACKWELL, of Cincinnati, Rev. SAMUEL J. MAY, of Syracuse, and others to be hereafter announced.

As full an attendance of the members and friends of the Society as practicable, from all parts of the country, is earnestly desired and strongly urged.

We reiterate our former declaration, that the object of the Society is not *merely* to make "Liberty national and Slavery sectional"—nor to prevent the acquisition of Cuba—nor to restore the Missouri Compromise—nor to repeal the Fugitive Slave bill—nor to make Kansas a free State—nor to resist the admission of any new slave State into the Union—nor to terminate slavery in the District of Columbia and in the National Territories—but it is, primarily, comprehensively, and uncompromisingly, to effect the immediate, total and eternal overthrow of Slavery, wherever it exists on American soil, and to expose and confront whatever party or sect seeks to purchase peace or success at the expense of human liberty. Living or dying, our motto is "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS, RELIGIOUSLY OR POLITICALLY!"

In behalf of the Executive Committee,
WM. LLOYD GARRISON, President.

EDMUND QUINCY, S. H. GAY, } Secretaries.

### *ARE WE TO HAVE CIVIL WAR?*

IF we are not, it will be no thanks to President Pierce and the Slavocracy which it is his pride to serve. They are resolved to bring the question to the arbitrament of the sword in Kansas, if they can. He, because he thinks that it is only in the smoke and confusion of such a struggle that he can keep his possession of the White House; they, because they see that now is the golden moment for securing their triumph, finishing the destruction of the Missouri Compromise, completing their triumph over the Free States, and opening the whole domain of the Nation to Slavery, and that if they lose the tide at its flood, it may leave them high and dry when it ebbs again. It is the denouement of the plot, the catastrophe of the drama, the upshot of the conspiracy. Civil War or submission on the part of the Free State men is inevitable. Slavery exists in its proper domain by the sword. The complicity of the North is secured by terrorism. The whole policy of the General Government, as well as of the several Slave States, looks directly to the edge of the sabre and the mouth of the cannon for the argumentation that is to uphold the Supreme Power of the Land. That it has not unsheathed its talons and laid bare its fangs long ago, is only because the North were content to submit in patience to its insults and injuries. It has had only to show them and all have crouched before it. It thinks, doubtless, that it will obtain a bloodless victory now.

Will it do so, or not? This is the question which absorbs the attention of all reflecting men at this crisis of our history. We can hardly believe that there is blood enough left in the veins of the North willing to pour itself out in defence of a principle which does not come instantly in contact with their daily lives and daily gains. That Kansas cannot stand a contest with the United States, single-handed, is plain enough. If the North, or any considerable portion of it, be determined to resist this aggression of the Slave Power dressed in the uniform of the United States, the Slave Power and the Nation will decline the conflict. The whole question turns upon the state of the Northern mind. If the State of Ohio, or New York, for instance, would take the side of Kansas and furnish her with men and money, openly and by Legislative enactment, the Border Ruffians would be whistled off, the United States troops be sent to pursue their natural prey, the Indians on the frontier, and President Pierce would begin to make his political will and prepare for the purgatory of New Hampshire. But is the public sentiment of the North yet ready for so decided a stand? We think that the disease of Compromise with which the Nation was inoculated in 1789 is still too strong in its veins for so sudden a return to the hardy energy of Seventy-Six. That inoculation gave us a new Constitution, to be sure, but it was at the expense of what alone makes any Constitution worth anything—health, strength and elasticity.

The Kansas Conspiracy has been conceived and carried forward to this moment with marvellous adroitness. The actors on the scene are low and base enough. The Atchisons and Stringfellows, and the Border Ruffians they manœuvre, are of the off-scouring of the earth, beyond a doubt. And so are armies of all kinds made up of the sweepings of the streets, the refuse of the jails and the leavings of the gallows. It is the head that plans their movements and the officers that put them into action that is the important thing. The whole scheme of policy in Kansas shows that there is a master-hand behind the curtain that works the wires and makes these puppets advance or retire as best suits its purposes. The plan, as thus far developed, is worthy of Machiavel himself—is as full of sagacity and as utterly unconscious of principle as the *coup d'état* of Louis Napoleon. The game was to get a *primâ facie* case, to set up a technical show of law on their side, it mattered not how. Therefore, the hordes of barbarians were marshalled over the river and led to storm the polls and carry the ballot-boxes at the point of the bowie-knife and at the revolver's mouth. A Legislature was thus elected, and, through the weakness of Gov. Reeder, who "let I dare not wait upon I would, like the poor cat in the adage," they were suffered to obtain a sort of official recognition. This was all that was wanted. Reeder was ignominiously dismissed, as insufficient for the emergency—as he had shown himself, indeed—and a more unscrupulous tool put in his place. This Legislature then proceeds to enact the most diabolical code of laws imaginable for the next move in the game. When the actual inhabitants of the Territory undertake to establish their Constitution of Government, they find themselves anticipated, another set of men already established in the two houses, and the President, with whatever force the United States can command, eager to make good the intrusion.

Now, in this state of things, there seems to be no middle term between submission and Civil War. President Pierce will back up the Missouri intruders. It is said he has given orders for the arrest of the Free State Officers of Government as in a state of open rebellion against the lawful authorities. The question must soon come to a settlement. Colonel Sumner, a Massachusetts man and a relative, if we are not mistaken, of the Massachusetts Senator, is in readiness to bring his command into the field. There will be no lack of vagabonds to volunteer in the cause of their country, with the certainty of pay and rations. Will the Free State authorities of Kansas feel at liberty to fight at this disadvantage? That must depend, first, on their own pluck, and, secondly, on the backing they are like to have from the Free States—for the hungriest of fire-eaters decline battle against impossible odds. All moralists agree that War is immoral unless there is a fair chance of success—which success, we all know, is what makes the difference between Revolution and Rebellion. Are the Free State men in Kansas of the sort that will stand to their guns on such a quarrel as this? We have no doubt they are as brave as the average of men, and, with a fair prospect of success, and in a cause of which they deeply felt the importance, they would fight as well as their Revolutionary Fathers. Have they such a sense of the far-extending reach of the issues involved in this quarrel? We do not see much sign of it in their determination to exclude certain men not only from power, but from inhabitancy, because the sun has looked upon them and they are black. Such men have no real, vital principle of action, no genuine appreciation or love of liberty. It is a conflict of selfishness in which they are engaged. It is for Right in a very narrow and contracted shape that they propose contending. On one side is the depreciation of their property and the certain impoverishment of their State, if Slavery prevails; on the other is the chance of being knocked on the head in the battle or being hanged by the neck after it is over. We are not as confident as some of our contemporaries that they are the men to run these risks in so doubtful a game.

Then what are the chances of help from the North? We hear a great deal about Material Aid, and there is much stirring speech and brave writing going about. But how many men are ready to march down to Kansas with rifles on their shoulders, halters round their necks and coffins on their backs? That is to say, in case of an open collision between the United States and the Free State Authorities? We imagine that there are many men who will help send out emigrants and contribute money to buy Sharp's rifles, as well as make speeches and write leaders, who would hesitate and fall back when what begun as Politics seemed likely to end as Treason. We heartily wish there were spirit enough in the nation to settle this matter at any hazard. But we see no reason for believing that the North, to any general extent, cares much about the matter. A large proportion of the Northern people are inclined to the right side; but we are afraid their zeal would not lead them to face the real inconveniences and imaginary horrors of a civil conflict. And why should they? Have not party leaders of all stripes been preaching to them, for years, the Supreme Duty of sustaining the Constitution and the Union? And do they not perfectly well understand that this means the sustentation of Slavery? Do not the most eminent divines of all denominations teach the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance to the Powers that Be? Did they not set up Congress in 1850 above all that is called God, and have they ever unsaid their sayings? Is it worth while to risk life and goods to hinder the mere extension of a system against which Dr. Spring is afraid to pray, for fear of accidents, and to which Dr. Dewey is ready to send back his mother, should the sacrifice of that venerable matron be demanded by his country? Can they be expected to do this in the face of Orthodoxy on the one hand, in the person of Dr. Adams, pointing to the Slaveland as to a true Canaan flowing with milk and honey, and with Unitarianism on the other, affirming in its organ, the New York *Inquirer*,* that a Contract to do things we know to be wicked is Sacred, which we are morally bound to maintain till it is convenient to alter it, and which it is sinful to violate? Morality well becoming the thieves'-quarters, the gambling hells or the stews. Are blasphemings and twaddlings like these the diet to breed martyrs and heroes on? We fear not; but we shall see. We *guess* that a new Compromise will interpose to save bloodshed, another of the many which make up, indeed, all the history we have, by which the South will gulp down the oyster while the North has to content itself with the shells.

*See notice of Mr. Conway's Sermon, "THE ONLY PATH," in the *Christian Inquirer* of February 23d.

### *MITIGATION OF SLAVERY.....II.*

IN our abstract of the Rev. Samuel Nott's "Suggestions for a Remedial Code," we now come to the section entitled "Education and Religious Worship." This opens with the (apparently) encouraging admission that "No doubt the slaves are human, and have a right to all possible advantages belonging to their humanity; are entitled to all possible provision for their wants as intellectual, moral and social beings."

No part of the Abolitionist's duty is more decided and imperative than that of unmasking the craft by which pro-slavery clergymen contrive to retain the essence of slavery in sentences which seem liberal and perfectly satisfactory to the unpractised reader. The Remedial Code gives to the "human being," which it proposes still to retain in slavery, a right to such *advantages* as the master, still remaining a slaveholder, may see fit to give him, but it says not one word about his right to *his rights*, and his right to examine and decide for himself *what those rights are*, and, having decided, to *assume* and enjoy them, subject only, like the rest of us, to the retribution which God has appointed for well or ill-doing, *and* to whatever just and equal laws of the land exist, guarding the rights of others. The Remedial Code concedes that the slaves, still to remain slaves, are entitled to such *provision for their wants* as the masters, still to remain masters, see fit to grant; but it evades the concession of their right to decide for themselves what their wants are, and how provision may best be made for them; and proceeds to take advantage of this evasion, as follows:

"In requiring, then, education and religious worship for the slaves, is it needful to abolish slavery? Or may we not aid and secure these advantages better by slavery retained?"

Mr. Nott goes on to say that education must be understood as including religious education, and this must also be scriptural. And here follow two most amazing declarations, thoroughly reversing the actual truth, and showing how entirely devotion to theory blinds the eyes to obvious facts. He says, "As Christian men, and a Christian people, we have accepted the Scriptures as the supreme guide and authority." Strange ignorance in our Supreme Court, our Commissioners, and Attornies General! They evidently suppose that the Fugitive Slave Act is the law of the land, instead of that very distinct and emphatic declaration of Scripture, "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best." But if a person, accused of giving food, clothing or shelter to a fugitive slave in need of all those things, should quote this passage as a defence, before Judges Grier, Kane or Curtis, he would probably receive an additional penalty for contempt of court, instead of having his claim allowed, according to Mr. Nott's false statement. The fact is, that though the Constitutions of the nation and its several States *compliment* the Scriptures a good deal, they specify as their supreme law something very different, namely, the will of the people, as expressed by their Senators and Representatives, and recorded on their statute books; and against the will of the people, so expressed, the opposite injunctions of the apostles and prophets, and of Christ himself, avail not a feather's weight nor a penny's worth; and nobody knows this better than the Rev. Samuel Nott.

But his next statement—as ludicrous as false—is that in accepting the Scriptures as the supreme guide and authority, "we provide against sectarian teaching." Now, all the sects in this country (except the Mormons) *do* thus accept the Scriptures; yet we really supposed, not only that their existence as separate sects implied a sectarian character, but that their sermons and newspapers and ecclesiastical meetings went far to corroborate that implication.

Having thus insured freedom from sectarism, Mr. Nott recommends that religious worship and instruction be provided for the slaves by union with that denomination which has already the vantage-ground in each particular locality, and by the use of a liturgy and *suitable* homilies on estates, or unions of estates, where there is not a stated ministry; also houses of worship, for the slaves alone where they choose it, and are sufficiently numerous; but preferably, for the masters and slaves together, with no other distinctions than belong to the relation of masters and slaves together, with no other distinctions than belong to the relation of masters and servants—that is, a well defined "negro quarter" in the house of worship.

Religious education thus leading the way, *all further education possible and suitable* to the individual will require to be provided for; and this, in Mr. Nott's judgment, will be comprised in instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic, which, he thinks, should be legalized, *if not required*, by the State. Behold a complete system of education!

Our author's next section, entitled "The Protection of the Laws: Judicial Provisions and Methods," makes the following suggestions:

1. The general laws of the State and the provisions for their execution must be considered as equally for the protection of bond and free; with only such just and merciful exceptions as belong to the *mutual relations* of capital and labour (i. e. of master and slave), still by law retained.

2. There must needs be a repeal of all cruel and oppressive laws. All *summary* whipping, even, must be forbidden.

3. In order to secure justice, it is indispensable to admit the testimony of slaves—with such conditions as shall best tend to secure its truth.

4. There *may be needed* the repeal of laws interfering with harmless liberties and innocent assemblages.

5. There may be required officers and courts of the slaves themselves; the officers to be chosen by the slaves, from their own number, *under power of veto by the master* or the higher courts. To which arrangements among the slaves themselves there might be added a clerk of court, *by appointment of the masters*, to attend upon and record all proceedings of the slave courts.

Next we have Mr. Nott's ideas on "Franchises and Freedom," as follows:

1. Slaves attaining a certain amount of property may be allowed a right of voting in the State—their votes having a *fractional value* compared with the votes of the free—and this fractional franchise might be *limited* to matters in which their own well-being is specially concerned.

The substance of this provision seems to be that the slaves may be allowed to play at voting—as they are allowed, in the previous section, to play at making laws. It would seem that these indulgences, like the lemonade which the Marchioness made of orange-peel and water, could afford gratification only by "making believe *very much*."

2. There should be open to all the opportunity of acquiring full personal freedom. The master may be required to sell the slave to himself, on the presentation, at once or by instalments, of a fixed, agreed, arbitrated or adjudicated price; and the liberty, or the fractions of it, thus attained, might be registered according to law.

3. "Slaves becoming personally free must come, with reference to franchise, *into the condition of their class* in the States where they reside. If it be insisted that there is no available freedom without full citizenship, *it may be replied* [since it is always possible to tell a lie] that the State has done its duty when it has legislated *for* them, though not *by* them—provided their absolute interests have been duly cared for [the same liberal terms were offered by the British Parliament to the American Colonies, before the Revolution]—and, if their position is still unsatisfactory, that they are at liberty to withdraw to those States where full franchise is allowed: no doubt *to be checked and disfranchised* if their ingress should be rapid and great—the sense of the North being now and then proving itself against *free soil* for large proportions of the African race in their midst."

Last, and not least significant of our author's provisions, are "The Methods for the Free," which would be *imperiously required* if freedom should extend to any considerable numbers.

1. Freed slaves may be required, for a term of years at least, to register their names, occupations, places of abode, and the returns of their industry up to a certain point, and, if found vagrant and neglectful, *may be compelled to labour.*

2. *Under the above regulation*, there may be allowed FULL LIBERTY of settlement and employment.

3. Methods of acquisition and investment should *be provided* for free coloured people, like those formerly mentioned for slaves.

4. The employments to which they are accustomed, and which are the most open to them, *are to be chosen, and are not to be forsaken without definite and good reason!* Servile employments are good employments *when God orders them.* Rising to higher employments *is not the thing to be desired.* In large communities there must be servile employments filled by those *whom Providence directs.* There is nothing degrading in serving others. Act well your part, there all the honour lies. There is room, *even in enforced service*, for the highest excellence and honour.

5. *This claimed*, then, let there be *every facility* for them to rise to independent and leading employments.

As much as to say—having chained a man's leg to the wall, and fastened one hand securely behind his back, and completed arrangements for keeping him so to the end of the present century—let there be every facility for him to go where, and do what, he pleases.

A principal method to "rise," Mr. Nott tells us, in conclusion, must be emigration to Liberia, as now, under the patronage of the American Colonization Society. But, he warns the aspirants to that promised land—telling a truth in such a way as to cooperate with the mesh of falsehood woven over the previous pages—"no more in Africa than in America can *everybody* have high office and high place, wealth, and ease, and honour; but the mass in Africa, as well as America, black as well as white, with or without freedom, is still "held to labour" by the necessities of human condition, and *by no act of man*; checking a thousand foolish aspirations of and for the African race."

Thus said Mr. Josiah Bounderby of Coketown to the "hands" in his factory, who were begging to have the terms of their work so arranged as to keep themselves and their families from starving—"I know you: the settled object and purpose of every man, woman and child of you is to be fed on turtle soup and venison, with a gold spoon, out of a silver plate; but you can't do it, and I won't help you to do it; and *therefore* you needn't ask of me any better terms than you have now."

Some observations upon the general scope of Mr. Nott's pamphlet, and upon the considerations on which he chiefly relies to recommend it to the public, will require one more article.

### *VIRGINIA LEGISLATION.*

THE Castle Garden merchants of this city, and mercantile men everywhere, will find a striking proof of the value of the Union in an act of the Virginia Legislature, passed at its recent session, for the protection of the slave property of that State. As the people of Virginia find that their slaves are too much for them, and that all the white man's ability and power are insufficient to prevent the absconding of many of their chattels, they have determined to make the sharper Northerners act as their police, and compel them to do so by inflicting the heaviest penalties upon every failure of duty, should it happen to be detected. The act itself we copy below. To say that it is an outrage upon common sense and all civilized legislation is nothing, for outrages of that sort are not only common, but inevitable, in all slaveholding communities. But the act is, nevertheless, more aggressive, and, at the same time, more absurd, than any other law that has ever before been passed to protect one villany by another. If the Southern people are not disposed to let their slaves run away with impunity, it is no more than is to be reasonably expected that they should prevent it if they can, punish the fugitive if they can overtake him, and inflict a penalty upon any other person who can be convicted of having given the absconding chattel aid. Merchants from civilized countries who choose to go among savages can hardly complain if they find stringent laws, and an effective police designed to protect what the inhabitants consider their rights; and if they wilfully offend such laws, they must expect to pay the penalty. But hitherto it has been considered the right, by the law of nations, of such traders, while they obeyed the laws of such people, to see to it that their own rights were respected, and, if they were not, to be well prepared to ensure their protection by their own strong arms. A New York merchantman would not hesitate to blow a Sumatran village into the air, if he had the power, if his vessel were exposed to constant pillage from the authorities, even under the name of law; and his government would justify the act, provided his purpose there were one of lawful trade, and no infringement had been commited, on his part, upon the reasonable requirements of local regulations. It will, perhaps, become worth while for the slave States to consider this principle in enacting such laws as that before us, for some peppery Yankee may, some

## KANSAS IN CONGRESS.

The Republicans are triumphing over another victory in Congress, though it is not precisely what they at first aimed for. On the question of who is entitled to the seat of delegate from Kansas the struggle has been to get a vote to send for persons and papers, but the motion to that effect has been superseded by a proposition of Mr. Dunn's, which passed, late last week, by a vote of 101 to 93, 38 being absent or not voting. This the Republicans consider as a triumph, and are rejoicing accordingly. It provides for sending a Committee of three to Kansas to inquire generally into the state of things there.

The vote was strictly a sectional one, and shows how naturally and inevitably the North and South divide against each other in any vital issue, which is openly and palpably so, touching the question of slavery. Of the 101 votes in the affirmative on Mr. Dunn's proposition, there is not a *single vote* from south of Mason and Dixon's Line; while in the negative, there are sixteen only—some doughfaces, of course, are inevitable—from the Free States.

It should not be forgotten, however, that this is only a preliminary question—the real one, of Kansas a free or slave State, lying far behind it. The Committee has yet to go to Kansas, yet to make its examination, yet to report to Congress, and Congress yet to act. The very calmness with which the South takes defeat on these struggles at advanced posts almost indicates a strength on which she feels she may rely when the great battle comes. It is evident, at least, that she is not at all frightened.

Mr. Dunn's Resolutions are as follows; they indicate precisely what the Committee are to do when they get to Kansas:

Resolved, That a Committee of three of the members of this House, to be appointed by the Speaker, shall proceed to inquire into and collect evidence in regard to the troubles in Kansas generally, and particularly in regard to any fraud or force attempted or practised in reference to any of the elections which have taken place in said Territory, either under the law organizing said Territory or under any pretended law which may be alleged to have taken effect therein since. That they shall fully investigate and take proof of all violent and tumultuous proceedings in said Territory at any time since the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska act, whether engaged in by residents of said Territory or by any person or persons from elsewhere going into said Territory, and doing, or encouraging others to do, any act of violence or public disturbance against the laws of the United States, or the rights, peace and safety of the residents of said Territory; and for that purpose said Committee shall have full power to send for and examine, and take copies of all such papers, records and proceedings as, in their judgment, will be useful in the premises; and, also, to send for persons, and to examine them on oath, or affirmation, as to matters within their knowledge touching the matters of said investigation; and such Committee, by their Chairman, shall have power to administer all necessary oaths or affirmations connected with their aforesaid duties.

Resolved further, That said Committee may hold their investigations at such places and times as to them may seem advisable, and that they have leave of absence from the duties of this House until they shall have completed such investigation. That they be authorized to employ one or more Clerks, and one or more assistant Sergeants-at-Arms, to aid them in their investigation; and may administer to them an oath or affirmation faithfully to perform the duties assigned to them, respectively, and to keep secret all matters which may come to their knowledge touching such investigation as said Committee shall direct, until the report of the same shall be submitted to this House; and said Committee may discharge any such Clerk, or assistant Sergeant-at-Arms, for neglect of duty or disregard of instructions in the premises, and employ others under like regulations.

Resolved further, That if any person shall in any manner obstruct or hinder said Committee, or attempt so to do, in their said investigation, or shall refuse to attend on said Committee, and to give evidence when summoned for that purpose, or shall refuse to produce any paper, book, public record, or proceeding in their possession or control, to said Committee when so required, or shall make any disturbance where said Committee is holding their sittings, said Committee may, if they see fit, cause any and every such such person to be arrested by said assistant sergeant-at-arms, and brought before this House to be dealt with as for contempt.

Resolved further, That, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of said commission, there be, and hereby is, appropriated the sum of $10,000, to be paid out of the contingent fund of this House.

Resolved further, That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to furnish to said Committee, should they be met with any serious opposition by bodies of lawless men, in the discharge of their duties aforesaid, such aid, from any military force as may at the time be convenient to them, as may be necessary to remove such opposition, and enable said Committee, without molestation, to proceed with their labours.

Resolved further, That when said Committee shall have completed said investigation, they report all the evidence so collected to this House.

The Speaker has appointed as the Committee to go to Kansas, Messrs. Campbell of Ohio, Howard of Michigan, and Oliver of Missouri. The latter is the minority and pro-slavery member, and was the choice of the South. Being a Missourian, and in full fellowship with the Border Ruffians, he will be very careful to do all in his power for that side of the question. Mr. Oliver is an able man, and his appointment seems to have been in accordance with the wishes of the Republicans; but that of Mr. Campbell is not received with so much satisfaction, and was unexpected. Altogether the triumph seems to have its draw backs, in the eyes of the Republicans, since the appointment of the Committee. They accepted a *compromise* in consenting to send a Committee to Kansas, instead of sending to Kansas for persons and papers, and the very name of the thing is almost a fatality.

P. S. Since the above was in type, the resignation of Mr. Campbell as Chairman of the Kansas Commission is announced. Mr. Sherman, of Ohio, is appointed by the Speaker in his place. He is, Mr. Greeley says in a letter from Washington to *The Tribune*, "a young but most intelligent and upright member, and will vie with Mr. Howard in earnest endeavours to elicit the whole truth and render impartial justice."

More European Stupidity.—A correspondent of *The Newark Advertiser*, writing from Italy, translates from *Il Monitor Tuscano* the following paragraph:

"The new President of the Congress of the United States, elected after two months daily balloting—Signor N. Banks—is a negro, belonging to the Republican representation of Massachusetts. As a man of colour, and as an Abolitionist, he does not enjoy the sympathy of the Southern representatives. The Democratic party, to which the administration of President Pierce belongs, and the party of the Know-Nothings have, notwithstanding, little pleasure in this choice."

These repeated mistakes of European journals as to the complexion of our distinguished men may do very well to joke about, but while our own papers indulge themselves in laughing at and pitying, by turns, such ignorance of the institutions and personages of the great republic, there is a more serious view of the subject that, to our surprise, is permitted to slip out of sight. What if *The Independance Belge*, *Il Monitor Tuscano*, and other distinguished newspapers abroad, should really persuade the reading public of their respective kingdoms that a black man may be as good as a white one, else he could not be elected to these positions of trust? The prospect is alarming. We have been told of a possible calamity that may befall Mr. Dallas at some royal or civic feast in London, and the condition of lacerated feeling into which that respectable old gentleman may be thrown in consequence. If people in Europe shall come generally to believe such an absurdity as that a man who is black may also be a very respectable, worthy and sensible man, and fit to be spoken to as anything else but a "nigger" by white people, the probability is that a great many other respectable persons, both old and young, male and female, beside Mr. Dallas, will have their sense of propriety outraged, their republican pride and their Christian feelings trampled under foot by these minions of despotism. There are already some besotted people in England, and elsewhere abroad, who have been known to receive as acquaintances and friends some of these men whose complexions, in this country, have set them apart, as evidences of the undying wrath of God, and the beneficent provisions of the American Constitution. But if the number of such persons shall increase, and if, especially, persuaded by these unprincipled European journals, they shall come to believe that even we Americans know no better than to forget the distinction which Noah made between his children, they may come at last to believe that any American is very likely a black man. It used to be a common notion in Europe that everybody in this country was copper-coloured. That injurious imputation was submitted to with some patience, as the Indians were not supposed to have descended from Noah, but to have saved themselves on a raft, at that epoch; and there was, moreover, that sort of romance surrounding them that made John Randolph proud of a descent from Pocahontas. But it will be quite a different thing when we are all considered blacks, or, at best, mulattoes. Think of Mr. Smith, of Fifth Avenue, of a somewhat bilious look, being asked if his mother was full-blooded; or Mr. Legree from New Orleans, of a rather burnished complexion, if his father was a "Guinea nigger"; or Mr. Dallas from Pennsylvania, if his hair lost its *blush* when it turned white? The very simplicity with which such questions will be put will make them the more aggravating, as they ignore all knowledge of a privileged class in this country—the very fact of the existence of an American aristocracy. There would be no end to the mortification which would be innocently heaped upon the heads of our travelling countrymen by well-meaning acquaintances, and the worst of it would be that there could be no possible propriety in evincing a natural and inevitable resentment. All that could be said would be, as the *Herald's* correspondent said of Mr. Dallas—"Think of his feelings"! One could hardly knock a man down for presenting a sort of hereditary claim to your gratitude and respect, because his father or grandfather was an original member of the Society of *Amis des Noirs*; or for condolence or congratulation that your ancestors had had such a hard time of it, or that you evidently were in very comfortable circumstances. Any of these sympathizing impeachments might reasonably enough render a pure Anglo-American almost beside himself with indignation and grief, but how could he possibly resent such a friendly interest in national and individual peculiarities? And even if the harrassed and badgered individual could persuade his tormentor that he had no birthright in Africa, it would only be to convince him that he must be an Abolitionist. And what would this be but heaping insult upon injury?

We all know from what little beginnings a popular delusion often springs, and stranger things have become fixed as a universal and deep-rooted belief than this which threatens to turn this great and free people into a nation of Blackamoors in the opinion of the rest of the civilized world. There would be, moreover, a sort of poetical and Divine justice in it, which renders it all the more probable. Clearly, unless something more potent than jokes can be brought to bear upon this growing and dark delusion of our European contemporaries, we do not see but that the future American tourist in the Old World must have a hard time of it.

## THE SLAVE MARGARET.

The Standard of last week mentioned the loss of a steamer on the Ohio, on board of which were four of the Gaines slaves, and the drowning of Margaret's infant child at the time of the accident. The *Cincinnati Commercial* thus describes the incident, from which it seems that there is a doubt whether Margaret did not prefer for this child, also, death to slavery. It is probable we shall have before long to record the death of the desperate woman herself. The *Commercial* says:

When the accident occurred to the Henry Lewis, the negroes were in the nursery (as a place between the cabin and steerage in the stern of the boat is called), ironed by couples. After the disaster, they were heard calling for help and to be relieved of their handcuffs. Some one happened to be on hand to save them. Margaret had her child—the infant that she hit on the head with the shovel when arrested here—in her arms, but by the shock of the boat that came to the assistance of the Lewis (as one story goes) she was thrown into the river with her child and a white woman who was one of the steerage passengers, and was standing by her at the moment. This woman and the child were drowned, but a black man, the cook on the Lewis, sprang into the river and saved Margaret, who, it is said, displayed frantic joy when told that her child was drowned, and said she would never reach alive Gaines's Landing, in Arkansas, the point for which she was shipped, thus intimating a desire to drown herself.

Another report is that, as soon as she had an opportunity, she threw her child into the river and jumped after it. Still another story has it that she tried to jump upon the boat alongside, but fell short. It is only certain that she was in the river with her child, and that it was drowned, while she was saved by the prompt energy of the cook. We are told by one of the officers of the boat that Peggy was the only female among the slaves. It is probable, therefore, that the story about the good-looking mulatto girl, who was being sent South, and attracted attention and sympathy, is a romance. The last that was seen of Peggy, she was on the Hungarian, crouching like a wild animal, near the stove, with a blanket wrapped around her. Our readers will, we presume, be struck with the dramatic features of the Fugitive Slave Case, and that it progresses like a plot wrought by some master of tragedy.

First, there was the flight and the crossing of the frozen river in the twilight of morning, the place of fancied security, the surprise by the officers, the fight with them, the murder of the child, the arrest, the scenes about the Court-room and in the jail, the long suspense, the return to Kentucky, the removal to Frankfort, the separation there, the approach of the messenger with the requisition for Peggy, her removal to Louisville, the pursuit of the messenger, the boat on which she was to have been taken South leaving two hours ahead of Cooper with the writ from Governor Morehead; then the speedy catastrophe to the steamer, the drowning of the babe of the heroine, and her own rescue, as if yet saved for some more fearful and startling act of the tragedy; and lastly the curtain falls, leaving her wet and dismal, on a boat bound South, perfectly careless as to her own fate, only determined never to set her foot on the soil of Arkansas. There is something fearfully tragic about this, which must occur to every mind, and we shall look with much interest for information of the catastrophe which will complete the dramatic unity of the affair.

And here an incident, related to us as occurring during the awful moments when the Henry Lewis was sinking and breaking, suggests itself to us. It is not wholly authentic, but is worth telling anyhow. Marshal Butts, of Covington, who had charge of the negroes, is said to have been inflated somewhat with the importance of his position, and talked of his charge as his niggers, and displayed an immense amount of cutlery and fire-arms, with which he expressed himself resolved to slaughter whole armies of Abolitionists. And it happened that he exchanged some sharp words with a gentleman on the steamer about the Fugitive Slave case, &c. When the accident occurred, he was in his room, and, one of the tables rolling against his door, he could not get out, and yelled tremendously for assistance. Some persons heard him and went to work cutting a hole through the roof to let him out. The most active of those so engaged was the man with whom he had had the quarrel.

When a hole was made large enough to let the rescuer and the prisoner communicate with each other, but not sufficient to crawl through, the man with the axe learned for the first time whom he was labouring to save, and called out, "Hallo, Butts, is this you? D—n you, if I'd known that, you might have drowned. And (after a moment's reflection) you shall anyhow, if you won't give your word to let those niggers go." There was no time to be lost, and Butts, fearing that he might be left to perish, said—"To tell the truth, now, I don't own the niggers. If I did, I'd let 'em go. I'm only the agent." "Well," said the man holding the axe of deliverance or death, "take the irons off them anyhow." That Butts agreed to do, and, the opening being enlarged, he crawled out, and began to inquire with some anxiety: "Where's them d—n niggers?" and was much gratified when he found that only the baby was lost.

## THE PHILADELPHIA LECTURES.

The closing lecture of the Philadelphia Anti-Slavery Course was delivered in Sansom Street Hall on Friday evening last by Hon. Henry Wilson of the U. S. Senate. The subject of the discourse was "The Position of the Slave Power and the Duties of the Free States in regard to it"—a pregnant theme and one to which, we understand, the able Senator did ample justice. Mr. Wilson was plain, pointed and practical, and his statements and appeals were received by the audience with the liveliest enthusiasm.

We congratulate our Philadelphia friends on the success of their course. They have had to address them some of the ablest champions of Freedom—champions holding different opinions on minor points and each looking at the subject from his own peculiar point of view, but all animated by a common desire and purpose to cooperate for the arrest of the progress of slavery, and for the final overthrow of the atrocious system.

The good seed which has been sown by these lectures will, in due time, and that soon, produce a plentiful harvest. Philadelphia, and the State of which she is the commercial capital, labour under some disadvantages of geographical position which have heretofore kept her and it somewhat on the back ground in this anti-slavery contest. Close proximity to slavery, and intimate connection in business and social relations, are circumstances which are strongly adverse to rapid anti-slavery progress. The fact is, Pennsylvania is more circumscribed by slave territory than any other free State in the Union. No wonder, then, that her politics and public sentiment generally have been so strongly marked with pro-slavery characteristics. But, of late, a great change for the better has been manifesting itself in the spirit of her people. The steady, persevering, unostentatious labours of the Pennsylvania Abolitionists have not been in vain; and an evidence of this is seen in the able delegation which now represents that State in the Federal Legislature. Pennsylvania is not only more ably represented in Congress than she has been before, for the last twenty-five years, but she has a representation there which puts her in advance of many of her sister States more favourably situated. Among her members are men ready in debate, prompt in action, and not wanting in courage. Such men as Hickman and Kunkel, Grow and Covode, Campbell and Todd, Edie, Purviance, Roberts and others, are a credit to her, and give us a respect for the Old Keystone State such as we have never before cherished.

☞Hon. Wm. H. Seward and Hon. John P. Hale, of the U. S. Senate, and Hon. J. R. Giddings of the House, will accept our thanks for valuable Public Documents.

## From our Cincinnati Correspondent.

*Division in the Ohio Council of Americans—The Slave Case again—Peggy sent to the South and sold—Judge Burgoyne's Decision.*

Cincinnati, March 22, 1856.

There has been a grand "flare up" in the Ohio State Council of the American party, which held a Convention at Columbus, on the 20th inst., at the call of Lieut.-Gov. Ford, President of the Order in this State. After an exciting debate, the nomination of Fillmore and Donelson was repudiated, and the restoration of the Missouri Compromise line insisted upon, as one of the articles of faith of the party. A minority (numbering 47 in all) immediately seceded, and organized a new Council on the "National" or Philadelphia platform, and were constituted by C. B. Bartlett, of Covington, Ky., President of the Order in the United States. He declared the Ohio Council to be *out of the Order*, having refused to submit to the decrees of the National Council. The forty-seven seceders mentioned above are mainly from this city and section of the State, and are the same men who put forward Gov. Trimble last Fall, and used their best endeavours to defeat Mr. Chase. They make a great ado, especially in their organ, the Cincinnati *Times*, but cannot even carry their own party in the State with them. The masses of the American party in Ohio, as well as the Republicans, are determined to insist upon a decided Anti-Slavery Platform. No party can carry the State without such an one.

The nomination of Fillmore has not been received with any enthusiasm at the West. There have been no ratification meetings held west of Pittsburg, and very few papers have come out in support of the nomination. The *Times*, a rabid and ultra Know-Nothing paper, is the only one in this place which has run up the Fillmore flag. The Americans made a mistake in making their nomination too early, and in taking an old politician and Representative of the conservative Whig party, of the school of Webster and Winthrop—a party which the people have rejected. If Fillmore accepts the nomination, it will be, in effect, setting the old Whig party on its legs again, as nine-tenths of the Know-Nothings are of that class, and the most "National" and Union-saving type of it too.

The late Slave Case in this city has been a remarkable one from the beginning, and will be to the end, which is some distance in the future yet. Mr. Gaines, the owner of Peggy and her children, after promising in open Court here, and to several persons in private conversation, that he would keep them until a requisition could be made by the Governor of Ohio, sent them to the South, on the Steamer Henry Lewis, which was run into by another boat and wrecked on the Ohio. Peggy narrowly escaped with her life, and one of her children was drowned. The requisition was made, but arrived too late, Gaines stating that he had kept them as long as he had promised, and he had sent them to his brother's plantation in Arkansas. Mr. Gaines has been severely censured by our papers for breaking the promise he made while here, and evading the requisition by sending the slaves to Louisville on the very night before Governor Chase's agents arrived at Frankfort. He and his counsel here, Col. Chambers, have published statements attempting to exempt themselves from all blame, or any dishonourable conduct in the matter—with what success, you may judge by reading for yourselves. Within a day or two it has transpired that Peggy was not kept at the plantation in Arkansas to which she was sent, but shipped to New Orleans and sold to another master. It seems very doubtful, to say the least, whether she will ever be brought to Ohio for trial.

Judge Burgoyne, who issued a writ demanding the children of Peggy of the United States Marshal, has had the case before him several times, and has taken a stand as decided as that of Judge Parker in the Rosetta case. It is thought he will imprison the United States Marshal (now absent from the city), on his return, but, if so, he will be at once discharged by Judge McLean, and the action of our State Courts declared void, as in the Rosetta case. Judge Burgoyne's action is interesting, as showing the increasing disposition of our State Judges to make something like a stand for State Rights against the Slave Power. Yours, P.

P. S. I have just learned that the Bill against the United States Government for the services of Assistant Deputy Marshals, &c., in the late Slave Case was $23,000!! The Bill of the Court (besides what he got of the claimants) was about $350. The Marshal kept all the Deputies in service under pay at an expense of $200 per day, during the ten or twelve days the Commissioner was writing his decision. Marshal Robinson is now at Washington to get the pay claimed, and is expected home daily. All this I have from the best authority. P.

The Border Ruffians.—The *Squatter Sovereign*, Stringfellow's paper, reports the holding of meetings recently at Platte City, and Weston, Mo., to find means to forward "the interests of the Pro-Slavery party in Kansas, and for the purpose of settling men there who are known to be true to the interests of the South and the Union of the States." The *Squatter* is right, at least, in coupling "the interests of the South and the Union of the States" as identical. The paper adds that several thousand dollars of stock were subscribed immediately at Platte City.

The Kansas *Herald of Freedom*, however, thinks that the Border Ruffians have changed their tactics, and that, encouraged by the President's Proclamation, their plan now is to flood the Territory with mercenaries, who shall come as settlers, each securing 160 acres of land from the Government, who may be relied on for thorough pro-slavery service, instead of actual invasion, with arms in their hands to subject the Territory as a conquered country. *The Herald* is disposed to rejoice at this state of things, and relies on Northern immigration to counterbalance any such influx from the Southern States. And perhaps it is right, but we are far more inclined to believe that a change of tactics is more to be dreaded than open violence. The Free States' men may screw themselves up to resist force by force, and, if a civil war ensues, perhaps the Northern blood may be aroused to assert Northern rights at the point of the bayonet or the muzzle of Sharp's rifles. If the South is quiet, and pretending to peaceful measures, it is only the cat covering herself with meal.

Business on the U. G. R. R. at Cincinnati.—A correspondent of *The Tribune* at Cincinnati, in a recent letter, says:

"An item of underground railroad intelligence came to my notice the other day, which I wish the readers in good faith and implicit confidence of Dr. Adams's book could have seen. A dark-coloured mulatto woman passed through here some weeks since, accompanied by her child, the son of a Mr. Vaughan, of Kentucky. The boy was about six years old; his head was very finely shaped, *forehead high and prominent*, features regular and European, *eyes blue, hair flaxen, complexion white*. The chattel was neatly dressed (his mother spent all the money given her by her owner upon this boy), was very gentle and well behaved, 'could read in the second primer,' and was worth about $400. The mother had made three attempts previously, and this time she came armed, determined to be free or die.

"The Underground Railroad is very much travelled at present. Mrs. L. S. Blackwell, at an anti-slavery festival, a week ago (where over $200 of Underground stock was taken), stated, as the result of her observation, that, during the icebound state of the river, thousands had escaped. Some 175 have passed through Cincinnati within three months, and they are daily going."

The *New Orleans Picayune* mentions the incident, an account of which was brought by a recent steamer, of a young mulatto girl being found on board the Ship Austin, at Liverpool, from New Orleans. A reward of $500 had been offered for her in that city, the *Picayune* says, and adds: "She is now in Liverpool, and will probably die in the workhouse."

As so large a reward as $500 was offered for the girl's recapture, it is very evident that she would have died in a far worse place than the workhouse if she had been kept in New Orleans. And even if she should die in an English workhouse, she would have there the advantage of being a pauper whom the parish would be compelled to take care of, and whom nobody could sell; while in Louisiana her only birth-right was that she was a pauper at large, whom somebody could sell, as long as she was young and handsome, and whom nobody would keep from starving when she was past work and worthless. *The Picayune* is not wise in provoking such comparisons.

"The Case of Passmore Williamson."—A complete history of this important case has been published and is for sale at this Office and at the Anti-Slavery office, Philadelphia. It makes a thick pamphlet of near 200 pages, and embraces a full report of all the proceedings from the beginning down to the present time, including the arguments of counsel, stenographically taken, and the several opinions of the Judges. Price 25 cents. Sent by mail, postage paid, single copy, for 35 cents or 3 copies for $1. Orders for copies by mail may be addressed to this Office, or to J. M. McKim, at the Anti-Slavery Office in Philadelphia.


30 DOLLARS REWARD.—Ran away from the subscriber, on the 7th inst., a negro man named HENRY. He is about 38 years old, of a dark brown colour, medium size and height. The said negro was hired by me from Martha Allen. I will pay the above reward of $30 for his apprehension and confinement in any jail in the State of Virginia, so that I get him again. LEWIS HYMAN, 95 Main st.
Richmond, March 18th. mh 18—2w

ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS REWARD.—Ranaway from the subscriber, a negro man named TAZEWELL. He is about twenty-six years of age, a light-black, of medium size. When spoken to he shows his teeth, and appears confused. He has a free wife, named Eliza Coles, residing on 22d, between Main and Franklin streets. I will pay the above reward for the apprehension and delivery to or confinement of said negro in any jail, so that I can get him again.
THOS. JONES, No. 30 Main street,
mh 11—ts Richmond, Va.

The local agent of the U. G. R. R. requests us to say to Mr. Lewis Hyman, and Mr. Thomas Jones, of Richmond, that they may save themselves the expense of a further insertion of these advertisements in *The* (Richmond) *Dispatch*. Tazewell and Henry both passed over to "'tother side of Jordan," one day last week, "shouting happy." Tazewell's confusion, Mr. Jones will be happy to know, was rather wearing off; and Mr. Hyman will be sorry to hear that Henry could n't send him any word about his sick sister—to go and see whom Mr. Hyman gave him a pass—as he changed his mind and went in another direction. If Mr. Hyman should happen to hear that she is as "comfortable as could be expected," and would insert an advertisement, to that effect, in any Toronto (C. W.) paper, it might meet Henry's eye.


Kansas in the Tabernacle.—A large and enthusiastic meeting on behalf of the Kansas settlers was held in the Tabernacle on Tuesday evening last, and addresses were made by General Schuyler, the new Secretary of State of the Territory; General Pomeroy, formerly of Massachusetts, now of Kansas; John A. King, of this city; Judge Conway, of Kansas, formerly from the South, and others. Measures were taken to procure substantial aid to Northern emigration to the Territory.

## ANTI-SLAVERY TRACTS.

The Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society have issued the following Tracts for gratuitous distribution:

No. 1. The United States Constitution, Examined.
No. 2. White Slavery in the United States.
No. 3. Colonization. By Rev. O. B. Frothingham.
No. 4. Does Slavery Christianize the Negro? By Rev. T. W. Higginson.
No. 5. The Inter-State Slave Trade. By John G. Palfrey.
No. 6. The "Ruin" of Jamaica. By Richard Hildreth.
No. 7. Revolution the only Remedy for Slavery.
No. 8. To Mothers in the Free States. By Mrs. E. L. Follen.
No. 9. Influence of Slavery upon the White Population. By a Lady.
No. 10. Slavery and the North. By C. C. Burleigh.
No. 11. Discnion our Wisdom and our Duty. By Rev. Charles E. Hodges.
No. 12. Anti-Slavery Hymns and Songs. By Mrs. E. L. Follen.
No. 13. The Two Altars; or, Two Pictures in One. By Mrs. Harriet B. Stowe.
No. 14. "How Can I Help to Abolish Slavery?" or, Counsels to the Newly Converted. By Maria W. Chapman.
No. 15. What have we, as Individuals, to do with Slavery? By Susan C. Cabot.
No. 16. The American Tract Society; and its Policy of Suppression and Silence. Being the Unanimous Remonstrance of the Fourth Congregational Society, Hartford, Ct.
No. 17. The God of the Bible Against Slavery. By Rev. Charles Beecher.

All donations for the Tract Fund, or for the circulation of any particular Tract of the above series, should be sent to Francis Jackson, Treasurer of the American Anti-Slavery Society, 21 Cornhill, Boston.

*Fifty dollars* will stereotype an eight-page tract, and print *five thousand copies of it*.

Application for the above Tracts, for gratuitous distribution, should be made to Samuel May, Jr., 21 Cornhill, Boston; to the Anti-Slavery Offices, 138 Nassau street, New York, and 31 North Fifth street, Philadelphia; to Joel McMillan, Salem, Columbiana Co., Ohio; or to Jacob Walton, Jr., Adrian, Michigan.

## Summary.

Why is Horace Greeley like a field of damaged wheat? Because he was *struck by Rust!—Utica Telegraph*.

The late Legislature of the State of Texas has passed a law giving to Mrs. Elizabeth Crockett a league of land. She is the widow of the late David Crockett.

Among recent subscriptions for Kansas are announced $300 from four gentlemen in Hartford; $1,200 in Lowell, and $30,000 in Brooklyn!

Unwell.—We (*Syracuse Standard*) learn that Rev. Mr. May has had a very dangerous attack of erysipelas during the past week. He was improving at last accounts.

Emigration to Kansas.—Quite a number of families of emigrants from various parts of the East, seeking homes in this portion of our Territory, have arrived here during the past week. A very large emigration is anticipated here this season.—*Omaha City Nebraskian, March 5*.

The Body of Robert Schuyler.—The N. Y. *Express* says: "We have good reason for knowing that the body of this man, whose name alive was once so potent in Wall street, came here in the steamer Arago from Havre, *wrapped up like a package of goods*. The body was here uncalled for in a warehouse from Saturday to Monday, and on that day was taken by his relatives for interment."

Donation to the City Library.—Dr. Walter Channing recently presented, says the *Boston Telegraph*, to the Boston Public Library, nearly all his medical library, numbering many hundred volumes. The gift embraces works on jurisprudence of rare value, and it is one of the most useful donation of books yet made to the library.

The Slave Case.—We learn through Col. John Finnell, of Covington, that Mr. Gaines has determined to bring Peggy back from Arkansas and deposit her in Covington, subject to requisition. Whether the rest of the family, required as accessories, are to be returned, we are not informed.—*Cin. Commercial*.

The late L. B. Leavell, a wealthy citizen of Elkton, Ky., by will provided for the emancipation of several of his slaves, and disposed of the entire residue of his large estate, said to be worth at least $200,000, to three or four of them, who by the provisions of the will, are to be removed to the city of New York as soon as practicable.—*St. Louis Intelligencer*.

A Lady in Command of a U. S. Fort.—Lieut. Montgomery, of the United States Army, not long since lost his life in the service in Oregon. His death left his widow, formerly Miss Northrop, of Akron, and one child, in comparative penury, as is generally the case with those who devote their lives to their country's service. She returned, and Gen. Jessup, with the kindness of heart and chivalry which characterize a brave soldier, immediately gave to her the trust of Fort Gratiot, now unoccupied by a garrison, a duty which she can fulfill, and the pay of which is very fair.

"Worthless and Improvident"—*One Fact worth a Hundred Arguments*.—Samuel Williams, a coloured man, sold his farm, near Clear Spring, Md., last week, containing near 200 acres, for $7,000, to John Pearl. The Hagerstown *Mail* says:

"Williams was a slave at 40 years of age, bought himself; has raised twenty-five children, four of whom he bought and manumitted. He is in his 71st year, and a stout, tall and intelligent-looking old man. He is now in independent circumstances. Most of his children are in the West, and the rest of them all desire to go to the same country, so the old man has consented, although fond of his country, to 'pull up stakes' and follow them."

A Husband Property.—The free North, after all, is not half as free, in some respects, as the South. Only in the slave States is it any woman's prerogative to go into the market and buy a husband on such terms that she can compel all the world to treat him as property, while she secures the advantages of getting a chattel instead of a master. This prerogative has been exercised by a New Orleans dame, one "Margaret Adams, a sprightly f. w. c., of No. 269 Benville street." The *Bee* says that on the 1st of March she made affidavit, before Recorder James, that her husband was her slave, "she having bought him for a husband," and demanded the arrest and amersement in damages of a bellicose free black named Edwin Nash, who had whipped her spouse so severely that he was confined to the house.

P. T. Barnum, the great showman, whose successful impostures are so glowingly set forth in his autobiography, published a year or two since, has just been examined under oath as an insolvent, before our Supreme Court. He says that he considered himself, in June last, to be worth half a million of dollars, above all his debts. By endorsement for the Jerome Clock Company, he has become hopelessly involved, he does not know to what extent. The shrewd old schemer endorsed in blank for the suckers who took him in, and left them to fill up the notes at discretion. They say the amount is $450,000, while Barnum supposed he was in for about $100,000. It seems to be as true now as it was in Solomon's day that "wealth gotten by vanity shall be diminished." Young men who were fascinated by the apparent prosperity of his early tricks may now profitably "consider the end." He says he is keeping boarders for a living, and has no property but his watch and $25 in money.—*Independent*.

Expected Visit from European Savans.—Some leading citizens of Albany, in which city the next annual session of the American Association for the advancement of Science is to be held, have entered into correspondence with the various packet-ship owners, hence to Europe, to secure the passage for notable European savans who have been invited to attend the August meeting of this Association. At this meeting, in addition to the ordinary proceedings, the State Museum of Natural History will be inaugurated by an address from the Hon. Wm. H. Seward, and the Dudley Observatory by an address from the Hon. Edward Everett. In view of the unusual interest which, under these circumstances the occasion may be expected to awaken, invitations to attend and take part in the discussions have been extended to many of the most distinguished scientific men of Europe, some of whom have accepted, and others, it is hoped, may be induced to accept if the great expense of the journey can be in some degree diminished. To meet this difficulty (the Association being voluntary, without endowment and conducted at much expense to its members), the Committee have solicited the aid of gentlemen interested in science, and efforts to advance our national reputation. In answer to this appeal, the Hon. Jas. S. Wadsworth, of Genesee, has generously subscribed $500 towards defraying the expenses of the distinguished chemist Lieberg, and the Committee are encouraged to hope other gentlemen will respond in a like spirit. If they can obtain the assistance of the several lines of Ocean steamers and packet-ships, they feel a strong assurance that they can secure the attendance of Mr. Airy, the Astronomer Royal of Greenwich, Le Verrier of France, Argelander of Germany, the Struves of Russia, and others distinguished in science.—*Tribune*.

Gaines not a Church Member.—It has been stated in several papers, our own among the number, that Mr. Gaines, the owner of Margaret and other fugitive slaves, was a prominent member and supporter of the Presbyterian Church, O. S., located near his place of residence. We were called upon yesterday by two gentlemen, who had made particular inquiries about the matter, and learned from the very best authority that Mr. Gaines is neither a member nor supporter of the Church. We are glad, for the name of Christianity, that this is the case. The late dishonourable conduct of the individual is enough to disgrace any man, and it would doubly disgrace a professor of religion.

Our reporter received the statement from a neighbour of Mr. Gaines, and incorporated it in a sketch of his appearance during the progress of the trial. This he handed to Mr. Gaines in the U. S. Court-rooms, and that gentleman, after reading it, came and requested a copy to send to his wife. He never denied the statement, nor did anybody else at that time. Perhaps Mr. G. thought it would help him to get his slaves. It is only since the negroes have been taken back that the statement has been corrected.—*Cincinnati Gazette*.

The Richmond (Va.) *Dispatch*, talking about Yankees locating in Virginia, is witty and wise after this fashion: "From Kanawha to Hampton Roads their nasal melodies will fill the air, and the whole heaven be perfumed with the incense of the savory cod. They will build double-track railroads to the Ohio and to the Tennessee line, and a ship canal from the James to the Ohio, in less time than it takes a contemplative native to turn over such an idea in the mind. Instead of our large estates, we shall have a multitude of small farms, cultivated by emigrants from the banks of the Connecticut; while Yankee schoolmasters, preachers, lawyers, doctors and artizans will overrun the land. The remaining Virginia families will be elbowed and hustled about by this Praise God Barebones generation, till they shall wish themselves dead or in Texas. True, these Obadiahs and Jehoshaphats will make Virginia the greatest State in the Union; but is it by these instrumentalities you wish her redeemed? One way or another Virginia must be redeemed; either by Virginians or by Yankees! It is for you, sons of the cavaliers, to decide by whom it shall be done, and whether Virginia shall continue a southern or become a Yankee State!"

"The Angel Gabriel," and Negro Riots in Demarara.—Accounts from Demarara, received via St. Thomas, to March 8, state that the negroes of British Guiana, stimulated by the harangues of the lunatic Orr, not unknown in this city as the Angel Gabriel, had risen against the Portuguese Coolies, who profess the Roman Catholic religion, and that several lives have been lost. Having failed in inflaming the minds or arousing the passions of the ignorant portion of the black population by violent harangues, in which he imputed every species of crime and immorality to the Roman Catholics, he took advantage of an existing feud between the negro population and the Portuguese immigrants, most of whom are Catholics, and stimulated an excitement against the latter that ultimately broke out into active hostility, and resulted in the pillaging and demolition of the shops of the Portuguese traders in the city. This occurred on the 18th ult., and was immediately followed by like disturbances in the country, throughout the colony, incited by emissaries from the town. The disturbances in the country seem to be still more serious, being attended, according to *The Georgetown Gazette*, by the loss of many lives. Detachments of the 2d West India Regiment were sent in steamers to Berbice, and up the river as far as the Great Diamond Plantation. The latter had returned with thirty prisoners. The former remained to suppress the civil power at Fort Canjo. Troops were also sent for to the Windward Islands, and a French war-steamer was placed by its commander at the disposal of the Governor.

A New Romance.—A Md'lle Maria Susanna, a white maiden lady, in her thirty-ninth year, has instituted a suit in the courts of New Orleans, claiming heavy damages of one Mathieu Richeto, for depriving her of her proper position in society, by industriously circulating reports that she is of coloured extraction. It appears that the lady, until she arrived at her majority, believed she actually was of African extraction—inasmuch as she had been reared and treated with all possible tenderness by Martha Don Andre, a mulatto woman, now seventy-five years of age, who pretended to be her mother—a belief which prevailed in the neighbourhood, from the fact that Martha took her to nurse very shortly after losing an actual child of her own. When Md'lle Maria became of age, then Martha told her how, in the year 1818, she had been brought to her, a newly-born infant, by a certain Madame Picote, with a request that she would nurse and rear her with all possible tenderness, for which she should receive a monthly stipend, and a particular injunction was made to keep secret the fact that she was the illicit off-spring of a young lady of high family, who had "loved not wisely, but too well." Shortly afterward, the mother, a beautiful lady of twenty, called at the house, and, after obtaining the most solemn promises of secresy, divulged her name and the unhappy circumstances connected with the birth of her child. Martha, the nurse, was then living with a white man named Gibbs; consequently Maria grew up in the belief that Gibbs was her father, and that Gibbs was her name. On reaching her majority, however, and being let into the secret of her history, she discarded that name, and assumed the *status* of a free white person. Since then she has been hindered from entering society, or experiencing any of the courtesies due to her blood, by the alleged slanderous reports above mentioned, Mathieu Richeto being the head and front of the offending. Richeto admits having made these reports, and stands up to them, asserting that he can prove the truth of them. It is a curious and interesting case, and will probably bring forth a racy trial.

Border-Ruffianism in Monmouth—A Coloured Speaker Mobbed.—Mr. C. S. Depp, a coloured man, came to our city on Monday last, and gave out notice, by handbills and otherwise, that he would lecture on the subject of slavery on Tuesday and Wednesday evenings. The Baptist church was procured, and Mr. Depp spoke to a very large audience on Tuesday evening, and, so far as we know, without any disturbance. On the following evening the Court-house was opened to him, and he commenced his lecture as usual, to a large audience of ladies and gentlemen, who had assembled to listen to him. After proceeding awhile, eggs and, we are told, other missiles were thrown at him, and Mr. D. was so badly injured in the mouth as to be compelled to leave the room.

We were not present, but learn that much excitement resulted in consequence of the mob. Mr. Depp lectured here about a year since to a large audience, after which a large collection was taken up to speed him on his mission of love and freed

# Miscellaneous Department.

From The Philadelphia Bulletin.

## JAMES'S LAST.

Mr. James, that famous Briton,
Has a novel new just written,
Which he calls "The Old Dominion,"
And he's plainly of opinion
That this story new, romantic,
Written this side the Atlantic,
Full of characters Virginian,
F. F. V.'s of the Old Dominion,
Is a very splendid fiction,
Novel in its plot and diction,
Destined, too, to make sensation
In this stirring Yankee nation.

Well, this novel new of James's,
Though it hasn't the same names as
Other famous stories written
By this persevering Briton,
Is the same familiar story
That our fathers have grown hoary
Over, reading, reading, reading
Twice a year, thus sadly feeding
On stale food, nor growing stronger;
For these thirty years, or longer,
They have had the same old diet,
The same miseries to sigh at,
The same love affairs to laugh at,
The same wishy-wash to quaff at,
The same cold and cloying dishes,
Unrelieved by soup or fishes—
Tough old beefsteak and tomato,
Only *nomine mutato*.

It is strange that, in Virginia,
G. P. R., our friend, could spin you
Thus a yarn of English fashion,
Old and weak and strung with trash on;
But it proves the ancient notion,
That those men who cross the ocean,
Though they change their native *cœlum*,
Keep, whatever fates assail 'em,
The same *animum* they carry
To the land wherein they tarry.

True it is, the ancient horsemen
Who are James's matter-of-course men,
In his other tales recounted,
Are in this one both dismounted,
And they're in a schooner seated,
Where they're very kindly treated,
For they're sipping good old brandy;
More than for their health is handy;
But we recognise their faces,
Their grimaces and their graces;
One is fair and somewhat larkish,
But the other's rather darkish,
And we give them friendly greeting
At this unexpected meeting,
Though we cannot help condolin'
That their horses have been stolen.

When he gets his party landed,
G. P. R.—we must be candid—
Shows us more familiar faces,
Ladies with the same old graces,
Men of dress and manners courtly,
Some with figures stout and portly,
Some of gentle birth and breeding,
Others both most sadly needing;
For he shows us, too, true villains,
Who are given to rows and millins.

But this novel's novel features
Are those of the sable creatures,
Slaves of old Virginia masters,
Who regard as worst disasters
All the plans of abolition
To change them or their condition.
And he shows us, too, some others,
Whom his countrymen call "brothers,"
Who get up an insurrection,
And, but for their prompt detection,
Would have filled the State with slaughter,
Making blood to flow like water.

Now, G. P. R. James, in former
Times, was known to be much warmer
In his love for sable creatures,
For their mind and for their features,
And long since he wrote a poem
For his English friends, to show 'em
How our Yankee starry banner
Was a satire, in a manner,
With a keen allusion knowing
To the "stripes" upon it showing.
But of late the Queen of Britain,
As reward for what he'd written,
Or to drive from her dominions
All his tales and stale opinions,
Made him Consul down at Norfolk,
That he might not show before folk
Any more of the old twaddle
That's engendered in his noddle.
Well, in Norfolk he's residing,
Where he finds excuse for hiding
Every abolition notion
That he had across the ocean,
And he flatters each Virginian
Of the courtly Old Dominion;
For a suit of tar and feathers
Isn't pleasant in all weathers.

But the Queen's benign intention
And her royal intervention
To suppress this fruitful writer,
Who for years has grown no brighter,
Has a failure been disastrous,
For he now begins to plaister us
With the old unpleasant mixture,
And he seems to be a fixture
In Virginia; for, Victoria,
You're determined he shan't bore you,
And you'll keep him down at Norfolk,
Where he cannot worry your folk
And where chance of fever yellow
May remove the writing fellow.

P.

March 15, 1856.

## THE OLD AND THE NEW.

From a Lecture by Archbishop Whately on Bacon's Essays.

There is no more striking instance of the silent and imperceptible changes brought about by what is called "time" than that of a language becoming dead. To point out the precise period at which Greek or Latin ceased to be a living language would be as impossible as to say when a man becomes *old*. And much confusion of thought, and many important practical results arise from not attending to this. For example, many persons have never reflected on the circumstance that one of the earliest translations of the Scriptures into a vernacular tongue was made by the Church of Rome. The Latin *Vulgate* was so called from its being in the vulgar, *i. e.* the popular language then spoken in Italy and the neighbouring countries; and that version was evidently made on purpose that the Scriptures might be intelligibly read by, or to, the mass of the people. But gradually and imperceptibly Latin was superseded by the languages derived from it—Italian, Spanish and French—while the Scriptures were still left in Latin; and when it was proposed to translate them into modern tongues, this was regarded as a perilous innovation, though it is plain that the real innovation was that which had taken place imperceptibly, since the very object proposed by the vulgate version was that the Scriptures might *not* be left in an unknown tongue. Yet you will meet with many among the fiercest declaimers against the Church of Rome who earnestly deprecate any of the slightest changes in our authorized version, and cannot endure even the gradual substitution of other words for such as have become quite obsolete, for fear of unsettling men's minds. It never occurs to them that it was this very dread that kept the Scriptures in the Latin tongue when that gradually became a dead language.

But, universally, the removal at once of the accumulated effects gradually produced in a very long time is apt to strike the vulgar as a novelty, when, in truth, it is only a *restoration* of things to their original state. For example, suppose a clock to lose only one minute and a few seconds in the week, and to be left uncorrected for a year; it will then have lost a whole hour; and any one who then sets it right will appear to the ignorant to have suddenly robbed them of that amount of time. This case is precisely analogous to that of the change of style. There was, in what is called the Julian Calendar (that fixed by Julius Cæsar), a minute error, which made every fourth year a trifle too long: in the course of centuries, the error amounted to eleven days; and when, about a century ago, we rectified this (as had been done in Roman Catholics countries a century earlier), this mode of reckoning was called "the *new* style." The Russians, who still use what is called "the old style," are now not eleven, but twelve days wrong; that is, the days of the month, as fixed in the time of Julius Cæsar; and this they call *adhering* to the Julian Calendar.

So, also, to reject the religious practices and doctrines that have crept in, by little and little, since the days of the apostles, and thus to restore Christianity to what it was under *them*, appears to the unthinking to be forsaking the old religion and bringing in a new.

In reference to the present subject, it may be remarked, as a curious circumstance, that there are in most languages proverbial sayings respecting it, apparently attached to what they have been used to; that use is a second nature; that they fondly cling to the institutions and practices they have been accustomed to, and can hardly be prevailed upon to change them, even for better; and then, again, on the other side, that men have a natural craving for novelty; that unvarying sameness is tiresome; that some variety, some change, even for the worse, is agreeably refreshing, &c.

The truth is that, in all the *serious* and important affairs of life, men are attached to what they have been used to; in matters of *ornament*, they covet novelty; in all systems and institutions—in all the ordinary business of life—in all fundamentals they cling to what is the established course; in matters of detail—in what lies as it were on the surface—they seek variety. Man may, in reference to this point, be compared to a tree whose stem and main branches stand year after year, but whose leaves and flowers are changed every season.

In most countries people like change in the fashions of their dress and furniture; in almost all, they like new music, new poems and *novels* (so called in reference to this taste), pictures, flowers, games, &c.; but they are wedded to what is established in laws, institutions, systems, and in all that relates to the main *business* of life. Every one knows how slowly, and with what difficulty, farmers are prevailed on to adopt any new system of husbandry, even when the faults of an old-established usage, and the advantages of a change, can be made evident to the senses. If you ask persons of this class their reasons for doing so and so, they will generally give, as an answer, which they consider quite a sufficient one, "that is what we *always* do."

This distinction is one which it may often be of great importance to keep in mind. For instance, the ancient Romans and other Pagans seldom objected to the addition of a new god to their list; and it is said that some of them did actually propose to enroll Jesus among the number. This was quite consonant to the genius of their mythological system. But the overthrow of the whole system itself, and the substitution of a fundamentally different religion, was a thing they at first regarded with alarm and horror; all their feelings were enlisted against such a radical change. And any one who should imagine that the Gospel could be received with some degree of favour on account of its being new—because, forsooth, men like novelties, and that, therefore, something short of the most overpowering miraculous proofs might have sufficed for its introduction and spread—such a person must have entirely overlooked the distinction between the kinds of things in which men do or do not favour what is new.

And the like holds good in all departments of life. New medicines, for instance, come into vogue from time to time, with or without good reason; but a fundamentally new *system* of medicine, whether right or wrong, is sure to have the strongest prejudices enlisted against it. If when the celebrated Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood, he had, on the ground that people often readily introduced some new medicine, calculated on a favourable reception, or even a fair hearing for his doctrine, which went to establish a fundamental revolution, he would soon have been undeceived by the vehement and general opposition with which he was encountered.

And it was the physicians of the highest standing that most opposed Harvey. It was the most experienced navigators that opposed Columbus's views. It was those most conversant with the management of the Post-Office that were the last to approve of the uniform penny-postage. For, the greater any one's experience and skill in his own department, and the more he is entitled to the deference which is proverbially due to each man in his own province [*peritis credendum est in arte sua*], the more likely, indeed, he will be to be a good judge of improvements in details, or even to introduce them himself; but the more unlikely to give a fair hearing to any proposed *radical* change. An experienced stage-coachman is likely to be a good judge of all that relates to turnpike roads and coach horses; but you should not consult him about railroads and steam-carriages.

True it is that great and sudden and violent changes do take place—that ancient institutions have been recklessly overthrown—that sanguinary revolutions have taken place in quick succession, and that new schemes, often the most wild and extravagant, both in civil and religious matters, have been again and again introduced. We need not seek far to find countries that have had, within the memory of persons now living, not less than nine or ten perfectly distinct systems of government. But no changes of the kind ever originate in the *mere love of change for its own sake*. Never do men adopt a new form of government, or a new system of religion, merely from that delight in variety which leads them to seek new amusements, or to alter the fashion of their dress. They seek change in what relates to serious matters of fundamental importance, only through the pressure of severe suffering, or of some vehement want, or, at least, from the perception of some great evil or deficiency. Widely as the vulgar are often mistaken as to the *causes* of any distress, or as to the *remedies* to be sought, the distress itself is real when they aim at any great revolution. If an infant beats its nurse, although its acts are as irrational as those of a mad-dog, you may be assured that it is really in pain. And when men are suffering from a famine or pestilence, though it is absurd for them to seek to obtain relief by establishing a new kind of Senate or Parliament, or by setting up a dictator, or by slaughtering all people of property, still the evil itself is real, and is keenly felt; and it is that, and not a mere love of change, for change-sake, that drives them to take the most irrational steps. And when evils are really occasioned by absurd and oppressive laws and tyrannical governments, it is right and rational to aim at a change, though the changes which an infuriated populace does bring will usually be both irrational and wrong—will overthrow the good along with the evil—and will be pregnant with worse evils than they seek to remedy. The ancient despotism of France, detestable as it was, did not cause more misery in a century than the Reign of Terror did in a year. And, universally, the longer and the more grievously any people have been oppressed, the more violent and extravagant will be the reaction. And the people will often be in the condition of King Lear, going to and fro between his daughters, and deprived first of half his attendants, then of half the remainder, then of all.

Hence, though it is true that innovations in important matters are never sought through mere love of change for its own sake, but for relief from some evil, the danger is not the less, of rash and ill-advised innovations; because evils, greater or less, and more or less of imperfection, always do exist in all human institutions administered by fallible men.

And what is more, there is seldom any kind of evil that does not admit of a complete and effectual remedy; if we are careless about introducing some different and, perhaps, greater evil in its place. It is seldom very difficult to dam up a stream that incommodes us; only we should remember that it will force for itself a new channel, or else spread out into an unwholesome marsh. The evils of contested elections, the bribery, the intimidation, and the deception which they often give rise to, are undeniable; and they would be completely cured by suppressing the House of Commons altogether, or making the seats in it hereditary; but we should not be gainers by the exchange. There are evils belonging specifically to a pure monarchy, and to an oligarchy, and to a democracy and to a mixed government; and a change in the form of government would always remedy one class of evils, and introduce another. And under all governments, civil and ecclesiastical, there are evils arising from the occasional incapacity or misconduct of those to whom power is entrusted; evils which might be at once remedied by introducing the far greater evil of anarchy, and leaving every man to "do as is right in his own eyes." There are inconveniences again from being governed by fixed laws, which must always bear hard on some particular cases; but we should be no gainers by leaving every judge to act like a Turkish Cadi entirely at his own discretion. And the like holds good in all departments of life.

Bacon's maxim, therefore, is most wise, to "make a stand upon the *ancient* way, and look about us to discover what is the *best* way"; neither changing at once anything that is established, merely because of some evils actually existing, without considering whether we can substitute something that is on the whole better; nor again, steadily rejecting every plan or system that can be proposed, till one can be found that is open to no objections at all. For, nothing framed or devised by the wit of man ever was, or can be, perfect; and, therefore, to condemn and reject everything that is imperfect, and has some evils attending on it, is a folly which may lead equally—and, indeed, often has led—to each of two opposite absurdities, either an obstinate adherence to what is established, however bad, because nothing absolutely unexceptionable can be substituted; or again, a perpetual succession of revolutions till we can establish—which is totally impossible—some system completely faultless.

The obvious dictate of common sense is, to compare and weigh together the advantages and disadvantages on both sides, and then decide accordingly.

### THE VIRTUES WHICH ARE MISUNDERSTOOD.

It often happens that a large portion of mankind not only do not praise or admire the highest qualities, but even censure and despise them. Cases may occur in which, though you may obtain the high approbation of a very few persons of the most refined and exalted moral sentiments, you must be prepared to find the majority (even of such as are not altogether bad men) condemning you as unnatural, unkind, faithless, and not to be depended on; or deriding you as eccentric, crotchety, fanciful or absurdly unscrupulous.

And this is the more likely to occur, because there are many cases in which the same conduct may result *either* from the very highest motive or from a base one; and then, those of the noblest character, and who are always cautious and intelligent, will always judge from your generous conduct and character *which* motive to assign; while those who are themselves strangers to the highest principle will at once attribute your acts to the basest. For example, if you shrink from some daring or troublesome undertaking which is always unjustifiable, this may be either from cowardice or indolence, or from scrupulous integrity; and the worst motive will be at once assigned by those who have no notion of the better. If you are tolerant in religion, this *may* be either from utter carelessness, like Galileo's, or from a perception of the true character of the Gospel; and those who want this latter will be sure to attribute to you at once the other. If you decline supporting a countryman against foreigners when they have right on their side, or a friend against a stranger, this *may* be either from indifference to your country, or your friend, or from a strong love of justice; and those who have but dim views of justice will at once set you down as unpatriotic or unfriendly. And so in many other cases.

If, accordingly, you refuse to defend, or to deny, or to palliate the faults of those engaged in a good cause, and if you are ready to bear testimony to whatever there may be that is right on the opposite side, you will be regarded by many as treacherous, or lukewarm, or inconsistent.

If you advocate toleration for an erroneous faith, and protest against forcing or entrapping, or bribing any persons into the profession of a true one, many will consider you as yourself either tainted with error or indifferent about religious truth. If, again, you consider a seat in Parliament, or any other place you may occupy, or the power of appointing another to such a place, as a sacred trust for the public service, and, therefore, requiring the sacrifice of private friendship—if you do justice to an opponent against a friend, or to a worse man (when he happens to have right on his side) against a better—if you refuse to support your friends, or those you have been accustomed to act with, or those to whom you have a personal obligation, when they are about doing something that is wrong—if you decline making application in behalf of a friend to those who would expect you to place your votes and interest at their disposal, whether your own judgment approved of their measures or not—in these and other such cases you will be, perhaps, more blamed or despised by the generality than commended or admired. For, party-men will usually pardon a zealous advocate of their party for many great *faults*, more readily than they will pardon the *virtue* of standing quite aloof from party, and doing strict justice to all. It will often happen, therefore, that when a man of very great real excellence does acquire great and general esteem, four-fifths of this will have been bestowed on the *minor* virtues of his character; and four-fifths of his admirers will have either quite overlooked the most truly admirable of his qualities or else regarded them as pardonable weaknesses. —[*Liverpool Journal.*

## WHY?

I am going to ask a few questions which frequently present themselves to my mind. I am not going to ask them with any expectation of getting an answer, but in the comforting hope that I shall find some thousands of sympathizing readers, whose minds are constantly asking similar questions.

Why does a young woman of prepossessing appearance, glossy hair, and neat attire, taken from any station of life and put behind the counter of a Refreshment Room on an English Railroad, conceive the idea that her mission in life is to treat me with scorn? Why does she disdain my plaintive and respectful solicitations for portions of pork-pie or cups of tea? Why does she feed me like a hyæna? What have I done to incur the young lady's displeasure? Is it, that I have come there to be refreshed? It is strange that she should take that ill, because her vocation would be gone if I and my fellow-travellers did not appear before her, suing in humility to be allowed to lay out a little money. Yet I never offered her any other injury. Then, why does she wound my sensitive nature by being so dreadfully cross to me? She has relations, friends, acquaintances, with whom to quarrel. Why does she pick *me* out for her natural enemy?

When a Reviewer or other Writer has crammed himself to choking with some particular abstruse piece of information, why does he introduce it with the casual remark, that "every schoolboy knows" it? He did n't know it himself last week; why is it indispensable that he should let off this introductory cracker among his readers? We have a vast number of extraordinary fictions in common use, but this fiction of the schoolboy is the most unaccountable to me of all. It supposes the schoolboy to know everything. The schoolboy knows the exact distance, to an inch, from the moon to Uranus. The schoolboy knows every conceivable quotation from the Greek and Latin authors. The schoolboy is up at present, and has been these two years, in the remotest corners of the maps of Russia and Turkey; previously to which display of his geographical accomplishments he had been on the most intimate terms with the whole of the gold regions of Australia. If there were a run against the monetary system of the country to-morrow, we should find this prodigy of a schoolboy down upon us with the deepest mysteries of banking and the currency. We have nearly got rid of the Irishman who stood by us so long, and did so much public service, by enabling the narrators of facetious anecdotes to introduce them with "As the Irishman said." We have quite got rid of the Frenchman who was for many years in partnership with him. Are we never, on any terms, to get rid of the schoolboy?

If the Court Circular be a sacred institution for the edification of a free people, why is the most abhorred villain always invested, in right of that frightful distinction, with a Court Circular of his own? Why am I always to be told about the ruffian's pleasant manners, his easy ways, his agreeable smile, his affable talk, the profound conviction of his innocence that he blandly wafts into the soft bosoms of guileless lambs of turnkeys, the orthodox air with which he comes and goes, with his Bible and prayer-book in his hand, along the yard, that I fervently hope may have no outlet for him but the gallows? Why am I to be dosed and drenched with these nauseous particulars, in the case of every wretch sufficiently atrocious to become their subject? Why am I supposed never to know all about it beforehand, and never to have been pelted with similar mud in my life? Has not the whole detestable programme been presented to me without variation, fifty times? Am I not familiar with every line of it, from its not being generally known that Sharmar was much respected in the County of Blankshire, down to the virtuous heat of Bilkins, Sharmer's counsel, when, in his eloquent address, he cautions the jurymen about laying their heads on their pillows, and is moved to pious wrath by the wicked predisposition of human nature to object to the foulest murder that its faculties can imagine? Why, why, why, must I have the Newgate Court Circular over and over again, as if the genuine Court Circular were not enough to make me modestly independent, proud, grateful and happy?

When I overhear my friend Blackdash inquire of my friend Asterisk whether he knows Sir Giles Scroggins, why does Asterisk reply, provisionally and with limitation, that he has met him? Asterisk knows as well as I do, that he has no acquaintance with Sir Giles Scroggins; why does he hesitate to say so, point blank? A man may not even know Sir Giles Scroggins by sight, yet be a man for a' that. A man may distinguish himself, without the privity and aid of Sir Giles Scroggins. It is even supposed by some that a man may get to Heaven without being introduced by Sir Giles Scroggins. Then why not come out with the bold declaration, "I really do not know Sir Giles Scroggins, and I have never found that eminent person in the least necessary to my existence?"

When I go to the Play, why must I find everything conventionally done—reference to nature discharged, and reference to stage-usage the polar star of the dramatic art? Why does the baron, or the general, or the venerable steward, or the amiable old farmer, talk about his chee-ilde? He knows of no such thing as a chee-ilde anywhere else; what business has he with a chee-ilde on the boards alone? I never knew an old gentleman to bug himself with his left arm, fall into a comic fit of delirium tremens, and say to his son, "Damme, you dog, will you marry her?" Yet, the moment I see an old gentleman on the stage with a small cape to his coat, I know of course that this will infallibly happen. Now, why should I be under the obligation to be always entertained by this spectacle, however refreshing, and why should I never be surprised?

Why have six hundred men been trying through several generations to fold their arms? The last twenty Parliaments have directed their entire attention to this graceful art. I have heard it frequently declared by individual senators that a certain ex-senator, still producible, "folded his arms better than any man in the house." I have seen aspirants inflamed with a lofty ambition, studying through whole sessions the folded arms on the Treasury Bench, and trying to fold their arms according to the patterns there presented. I have known neophytes far more distracted about the folding of their arms than about the enunciation of their political views, or the turning of their periods. The injury inflicted on the nation by Mr. Canning, when he folded his arms and got his portrait taken, is not to be calculated. Every member of Parliament from that hour to the present has been trying to fold his arms. It is a graceful, a refined, a decorative art; but, I doubt if its results will bear comparison with the infinite pains and charges bestowed upon its cultivation.

Why are we so fond of talking about ourselves as "eminently a practical people?" *Are* we eminently a practical people? In our national works, for example; our public buildings, our public places, our columns, the lines of our new streets, our monstrous statues; do we come so very practically out of all that? No, to be sure; but we have our railroads, results of private enterprise, and they are great works. Granted. Yet, is it very significant of an eminently practical people that we live under a system which wasted hundreds of thousands of pounds in law and corruption, before an inch of those roads could be made! Is it a striking proof of an eminently practical people having invested their wealth in making them, that in point of money return, in point of public accommodation, in every particular of comfort, profit, and management, they are at a heavy discount when compared with the railways on the opposite side of a sea-channel and five-and-twenty miles across, though those were made under all the disadvantages consequent upon unstable governments and shaken public confidence? Why do we brag so? If an inhabitant of some other sphere were to light upon our earth in the neighbourhood of Norwich, were to take a first-class ticket to London, were to attend an Eastern Counties' Railway meeting in Bishopsgate Street, were to go down from London Bridge to Dover, cross to Calais, travel from Calais to Marseilles, and be furnished with an accurate statement of the railway cost and profit on either side of the water (having compared the case and comfort for himself), which people would he suppose to be the eminently practical one, I wonder!

Why, on the other hand, do we adopt, as a mere matter of lazy usage, charges against ourselves, that have as little foundation as some of our boasts? We are eminently a money-loving people. Are we? Well, we are bad enough; but, I have heard Money more talked of in a week under the stars and stripes than in a year under the union-jack. In a two hours' walk in Paris, any day, you shall overhear more scraps of conversation that turn upon Money, Money, Money, Money, than in a whole day's saunter between Temple Bar and the Royal Exchange. I go into the Théatre Français, after the rising of the curtain; fifty to one the first words I hear from the stage as I settle myself in my seat, are fifty thousand francs; she has a dowry of fifty thousand francs; he has an income of fifty thousand francs; I will bet you fifty thousand francs upon it, my dear Emile; I come from winning at the Bourse, my celestial Diane, fifty thousand francs. I pass into the Boulevard theatres one by one. At the Variétes, I find an old lady who must be conciliated by two opposing nephews, because she has fifty thousand francs per annum. At the Gymnase, I find the English Prime Minister (attended by his faithful servant Tom Bob) in a fearful predicament occasioned by injudicious speculation in millions of francs. At the Porte St. Martin, I find a picturesque person with a murder on his mind, into which he has been betrayed by a pressing necessity for a box containing fifty thousand francs. At the Ambigu, I find everybody poisoning everybody else for fifty thousand francs. At the Lyrique, I find on the stage a portly old gentleman, a slender young gentleman, and a piquant little woman with sprightly eyebrows, all singing an extremely short song together about fifty thousand francs Lira lara, fifty thousand francs Ting ting! At the Imperial, I find a general with his arm in a bandage, sitting in a magnificent summer-house, relating his autobiography to his niece, and arriving at this point: "It is to this ravishing spot then, my dearest Julie, that I, thy uncle, faithful always to his Emperor, then retired; bringing with me my adorable Georgette, this wounded arm, this cross of glory, the love of France, remembrances ever inextinguishable of the Emperor my master, and fifty thousand francs." At this establishment the sum begins to diminish, and goes on rapidly decreasing until I finish at the Funambules and find Pierrot despolling a friend of only one hundred francs, to the great satisfaction of the congregated blouses. Again. Will any Englishman undertake to match me that generic French old lady whom I will instantly produce against him, from the private life of any house of five floors in the French capital, and who is a mere gulph for swallowing my money, or any man's money? That generic French old lady who, whether she gives me her daughter to wife, or sits next me in a balcony at a theatre, or opposite to me in a public carriage, or lets me an apartment, or plays me a match at dominoes, or sells me an umbrella, equally absorbs my substance, calculates my resources with a fierce nicety, and is intent upon my ruin? That generic French old lady who is always in black, and always protuberant, and always complimentary, and who always eats up everything that is presented to her—almost eats her knife besides—and who has a supernatural craving after francs which fascinates me, and inclines me to pour out all I have at her feet, saying, "Take them and twinkle at me with those hungry eyes no more?" *We* eminently a money-loving people! Why do we talk such nonsense with this terrible old woman to contradict us?

Why do we take conclusions into our heads for which we have no warrant, and bolt with them like mad horses, until we are bought up by stone walls? Why do we go cheering and shouting after an officer who did n't run away—as though all the rest of our brave officers did run away!—and why do we go plucking hairs out of the tail of the identical charger, and why do we follow up the identical uniform, and why do we stupidly roar ourselves hoarse with acclamation about nothing? Why don't we stop to think? Why don't we say to one another, "What have the identical charger and the identical uniform done for us, and what have they done against us: let us look at the account." How much better this would be than straining our throats first, and afterwards discovering that there was less than no reason for the same!

Why am I, at any given moment, in tears of triumph and joy, because Buffy and Boodle are at the head of public affairs? I freely declare that I have not the least idea what specific action Buffy and Boodle have ever in the whole course of their existence done, that has been of any appreciable advantage to my beloved country. On the other hand, I no less freely acknowledge that I have seen Buffy and Boodle (with some small appearance of trading in principles) nail their colours to every mast in the political fleet. Yet I swear to everybody—because everybody swears to me—that Buffy and Boodle are the only men for the crisis, and that none of women born, but Buffy and Boodle, could pull us through it. I would quarrel with my son for Buffy and Boodle. I almost believe that in one of my states of excitement I would die for Buffy and Boodle. I expect to be presently subscribing for statues to Buffy and Boodle. Now, I am curious to know why I go on in this way? I am profoundly in earnest; but I want to know Why?

I wonder why I feel a glow of complacency in a court of justice, when I hear the learned judges taking uncommon pains to prevent the prisoner from letting out the truth. If the object of the trial be to discover the truth, perhaps it might be as edifying to hear it, even from the prisoner, as to hear what is unquestionably not the truth from the prisoner's advocate. I wonder why I say, in a flushed and rapturous manner, that it would be "un-English" to examine the prisoner. I suppose that with common fairness it would be next to impossible to confuse him, unless he lied; and if he did lie, I suppose he could hardly be brought to confusion too soon. Why does that word "un-English" always act as a spell upon me, and why do I suffer it to settle any question? Twelve months ago, it was un-English to abstain from throttling our soldiers. Thirty years ago, it was un-English not to hang people up by scores every Monday. Sixty years ago, it was un-English to be sober after dinner. A hundred years ago, it was un-English not to love cock-fighting, prize-fighting, dog-fighting, bull-baiting and other savageries. Why do I submit to the word as a clincher, without asking myself whether it has any meaning? I don't dispute that I do so, every day of my life; but I want to know why I do so?

On the other hand, why am I meek in regard of really non-English sentiments, if the potent bugbear of that term be not called into play? Here is a magistrate tells me I am one of a nation of drunkards. All Englishmen are drunkards, is the judicial bray. Here is another magistrate propounding from the seat of justice the stupendous nonsense that it is desirable that every person who gives alms in the streets should be fined for that offence. This to a Christian people and with the New Testament lying before him—as a sort of dummy, I suppose, to swear witnesses on. Why does my so-easily-frightened nationality not take offence at such things? My hobby shies at shadows; why does it amble so quietly past these advertising-vans of Blockheads seeking notoriety?

Why? I might as well ask, Why I leave off here, when I have a long perspective of Why stretching out out before.—*Household Words.*

## PENN AND MACAULAY.

The new charges against William Penn are, that he was one of a band of conspirators to restore King James by the aid of a French army; that if not guilty of a deliberate falsehood, he manifested credulity and garrulousness in giving assurance to his fellow-conspirators, that certain noblemen were friendly to James, such assurance having no foundation; that, at an interview which he had solicited with a person deputed by King William to meet him, he told "something very like a lie, and confirmed it by something very like an oath"; and finally, that, three years later, having made his peace with the reigning monarch, he almost immediately "sent a message earnestly exhorting James to make a descent on England with thirty thousand men."

When we refiect that these grave accusations are brought against a man who had from his youth professed to believe in the unlawfulness of war; who had manifested the sincerity of that profession by landing unarmed on territory occupied by savages, generally reputed to be cruel and warlike, and founding in the wilderness a commonwealth on the principles of peace; against one who had ever taught, as he had practised, a morality of uncompromising strictness; who had voluntarily relinquished flattering prospects of worldly success, to maintain, in suffering, in imprisonment, in separation from his nearest connections, those religious convictions which, through a long and most eventful life, he uniformly declared to be dearer to him than all things beside; against a man of whom we have the testimony of many witnesses, his cotemporaries, that he was distinguished by wisdom, discretion and sincerity; surely it is not too much to expect that the indictment should be sustained by at least one credible witness.

Now, while gravely adopting these statements, making them, so far as he can do so, matter of history, the author informs us that the first two rest exclusively on the testimony of one individual. Of this sole witness—one Preston—we are told, that he was convicted of treason, and sentenced to be executed; that a fellow confessor was actually put to death; that Preston was promised his life on condition of making disclosures; that he was wholly unmanned by his situation; that the struggle between conscience and "intense love of life" was severe; that he was bold in refusing to confess when under the stimulus of wine, but very different when the excitement had passed; that he regularly made a confession every forenoon, when he was sober, and burned it every night, when merry. "The fatal hour drew nigh and the fortitude of Preston gave way." He made his pretended disclosures, and, after his release from prison, retired to a lonely dwelling to pass the rest of his life with "blighted fame and a broken heart." Such is the evidence on which Macaulay dares to convict William Penn of treason and falsehood; of repudiating the profession of a long life passed in public positions; of apostacy from those principles of religion and virtue to promote which he had suffered abundantly, as he had ever toiled in the labour of love. If it were needful to disprove the statements of a witness so utterly discredited by the accuser himself, it would be but necessary to recur to the admitted facts, that although a warrant was issued for William Penn's arrest, no active efforts were made to secure him; that although remaining some time in retirement, he was permitted to defend himself before a member of King William's Government; and that, finally, he was admitted before the Privy Council, and acquitted of charges which are now so maliciously reproduced.

The third charge is made upon the evidence of a better man, but it is clearly unsupported by the testimony. Penn, in the presence of Sidney, with whom he had long been acquainted, declared himself a faithful servant of King William and Queen Mary, protesting, it is said, as in the Divine presence, that he knew of no plot, unless the project of the French Government might be such. With a levity not unworthy of the absurdity of his assertion, Macaulay calls this "telling something very like a lie," and confirming it "by something very like an oath." Our author having discredited his own witness to the two first charges, there remains no reason for questioning the statement of William Penn. In truth, no statement could be more probable in itself, or more consistent with his own life-long profession. He was a personal friend of James, but his religious convictions had taught him to be a faithful subject of the ruling powers. Such was the acknowledged principle of the society of which he was so distinguished a member. As regards the expression which is attributed to him, he may have solemnly expressed himself as is charged.

That difference of opinion did not exist among Friends, as to any use of the Divine name in the affirmation, which, by law, was, at a later period, substituted for an oath, is well known. That it was an honest difference is undeniable—for it was between men who were ready to hazard their lives rather than abate one tittle from what they believed to be the Truth. Whether the expression imputed to him was used by William Penn or not, we may be well assured that he spoke reverently; and if it was used, it but proves that he, with George Whitehead and others, did not regard it as partaking of the nature of an oath.

The last charge, taken in connection with William Penn's well-known principles, is so absurd, that it is difficult to give it a serious examination.

William Penn, who, for twenty-six years, had been an unflinching advocate of the truth, as professed by Friends, who had just been acquitted by the government of King William, who had a most valuable Province in America to lose, and nothing to gain by promoting civil war—William Penn, we are told—with a soberness that provokes a smile, were it not suppressed by the malice which is revealed in the charge—no sooner finds himself at liberty than he sends a message to King James, earnestly exhorting him to invade England with thirty thousand men! This accusation would seem to stand self-refuted. It is, however, worth while to examine the authority upon which it is made, if only to learn how hollow is the foundation upon which our author is content to rest his historical edifice. This incredible assertion, it appears, is made upon the authority of "a paper drawn up at St. Germains, under Melfort's direction." By whom the paper was drawn, what was the occasion of its being drawn, or who had communicated the message from William Penn to the waiter, are important questions on which we are not informed. The court of the exiled monarch at St. Germains, was thronged with men who had lost their all; many of them men of profligate character, who had, for the present, an inadequate and most precarious subsistence; for the future, no hope but in the restoration of James. That such men were ever ready to promote the invasion of England, there is no doubt—that they were equally ready to invent falsehoods to effect their object, is very probable. In the absence of any name to prove that so improbable a message was sent, the whole story might be safely rejected. But one name *is* mentioned as having given some sanction to the charge. The paper was written under Melfort's direction. What was Melfort's character? Let our author again speak for his own witness. At p. 49 (Butler's Philad. Edition) he tells us, "He (Melfort) was an apostate; he was believed to be an insincere apostate; and the insolent, arbitrary and menacing language of his state papers disgusted even the Jacobites." Again, page 54, "He (Melfort) was a renegade; he was a mortal enemy of the liberties of his country; he was of a bad and tyrannical nature"—"his apostacy and arbitrary maxims of government made him the abhorrence of England and Scotland." Finally, at page 97, speaking of some intercepted letters, it is said, "Some of them proved to be from Melfort, and *were worthy of him*. Every line indicated those qualities which made him the abhorrence of his country," &c. "He announced with delight the near approach of the day of vengeance and rapine," &c. Such is the man upon whose implied testimony the character of a great and good man rests. It will be a relief to turn from Macaulay and his witnesses to the true character of William Penn, as portrayed by those who knew him well, and who are known to have been men of integrity and piety, and as exemplified in his eloquent and Christian teachings.—*Friends' Review.*

## THE APPREHENDED WAR WITH AMERICA.

Our readers will no doubt recollect that in the time of the dispute with the United States respecting the Oregon question, friendly international addresses passed between the two countries, and, it is believed, exercised a salutary effect on public feeling on both sides of the Atlantic.

The dreaded rupture of the ties of amity and friendship with America at the present time has, we are glad to say, again excited the same laudable feeling of lively Christian interest for the preservation of international peace; and, in consequence, Friendly and Fraternal Addresses to our American brethren are being promoted in several of the largest cities in the United Kingdom.

We give below those from Edinburgh and Glasgow. In the former city we learn the measure is being carried out in a very spirited manner; the Lord Provost, the City Councillors, the Ministers of Religion of all denominations, and a large number of the inhabitants having, during the last few days, adhibited their signatures. In Glasgow, the work is only just commenced, and we trust our civic authorities, and the inhabitants generally, will evince a similar alacrity in this benevolent enterprise; and that, in conjunction with the efforts of the friends of peace in other places, the movement may, under the blessing of Providence, be instrumental in effectually discouraging the war spirit.

### FRIENDLY ADDRESS

FROM THE INHABITANTS OF EDINBURGH, TO THOSE OF BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

We have heard, with deep regret, of a growing misunderstanding between the Government of the United States and our own; and feeling apprehensive that if the points in dispute are not speedily adjusted, the misunderstanding may terminate in an open rupture, we have deemed it right to address you as an influential part of the Union, in the hope that it may have a tendency to preserve that peace between the two nations, in which the well-being of both is so intimately concerned.

Not many years have elapsed since, on the occasion of a similar misunderstanding on the Oregon question, friendly letters were exchanged between some of the principal towns in Great Britain and those on your side of the Atlantic, deprecating a resort to hostile measures for the settlement of the point in dispute; and as we believe these were not without influence in bringing about a pacific settlement, we are induced to adopt a like course on the present occasion, in the hope that the Divine blessing may rest upon it, so as to lead to a corresponding happy result.

We cannot conceive a more dreadful calamity than that of two great nations, such as yours and ours—united as they are in the bonds of near relationship, and by the powerful ties of a mutual dependence on each other—being involved in the awful consequences attendant upon war, which in this case, more especially, would not only be a gross outrage to humanity, but the most grievous scandal to the pure and peace-breathing Gospel professed by both.

We would, therefore, earnestly appeal to you, as brethren in relationship, and fellow-professors of the Christian faith, to do all in your power to prevent the toleration for a moment of any attempt to settle this or any other political difference between the two nations by an appeal to arms. We hailed with much satisfaction the introduction into a recent treaty of a clause whereby it was stipulated that all future disputes on that question should be settled by reference to a third party, and there is surely nothing in the present case to prevent the pursuance of a similar course.

Permit us, in conclusion, to express an earnest hope, that this truly wise mode of settling international differences will be adopted in the present case, and that thus, both to our own beloved country and to yours, in the true welfare of which we feel a deep interest, may be preserved the inestimable blessing of peace.

### TO THE INHABITANTS

OF THE CITY OF BOSTON, UNITED STATES.

We, the Inhabitants of the City of Glasgow, address ourselves, with fraternal feelings and best wishes.

We are the friends of peace. We worship the God of peace. We profess a religion which proclaims peace on earth, and good-will to men. Recognising the brotherhood of man, our hearts desire to be at peace with the world. We look forward with hope and joy to the time when the righteous and merciful Governor of the nations will break the bow, and the sword, and the battle out of the earth, and will make men to lie down safely.

Regarding war as a dire calamity and sore judgment, it is with feelings of the deepest concern that we look on the present aspect of affairs between the United States and Britain. We are constrained to express wonder that peace between these two countries should ever be in peril. We cannot allow ourselves to entertain the thought that the amicable relations that have so long and happ